FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 153 8 August 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

West Seen Evading Basic Arms Control Questions [Zhukov in PRAVDA 4 Aug] AA 1
U.S. Space Plans Hold 'First-Strike Potential' [Pavlov in IZVESTIYA 28 Jul] AA 4
Nuclear Freeze Offer Renewed on A-Bomb Date [Zorin] AA 6
U.S Vote on Binary Nerve Gas Production Rapped [Dmitriyev] AA 8

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Bovin, Shishlin, Levin] CC 1
Arms Talks Stall CC 1
U.S. Central American Stance CC 3
Chad Examined CC 5
'International Situation: Questions & Answers' [Surguchev, Kovalev, Belyayev, Semenov] CC 7
Nuclear-Free Zones CC 7
Syria, Mideast Discussed CC 8
Latin America Reviewed CC 10
U.S.-Japanese Alliance CC 11
U.S. Scandal CC 12
Soviet Delegate Addresses Conference on Racism CC 13

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reagan Call for Freer Trade 'Hypocritical' A 1
U.S. Seen Disrupting Military Equilibrium [Semeyko in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Aug] A 1
USSR Chemical Weapons Use U.S. 'Hullabaloo' [Biryukov] A 5

NORTHEAST ASIA

U.S. Admiral Crowe's Meeting With Nakasone Reported C 1
'Anti-Soviet Direction' C 1
Demands Deployment [Andrionov] C 1
USSR Preconditions for Kuril Visitors Set [KYODO] C 2

SOUTH ASIA

U.S. Aims in Sri Lanka, South Asia Analyzed [Alov] D 1
DRA Spokesman Rejects Pakistani Accusations [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Aug] D 2
Supreme Soviet, Maldives Exchange Cables [IZVESTIYA 5 Aug] D 2

EASTERN EUROPE

PZPR's Czyrek Discusses Poland-USSR Bonds F 1
[PRAVDA 6 Aug]
U.S. Said Altering Strategy Against Poland F 4
[Danilov]
Information, Propaganda Officials Visit Poland F 5
[cross-reference]
Nuriyev, Baybakov Attend SFRY Exhibition F 5
Romania's Vlad Meets Counterparts in Moscow F 5
[AGERPRES]

WESTERN EUROPE

Brandt Counters U.S. on Deployment, Arms Talks G 1
IZVESTIYA Decries New 'Patriotic Fervor' in FRG G 1
[Grigoryants, 30 Jul]
Italian Socialist Party Shows Rightward Shift G 2
[Paklin in IZVESTIYA 5 Aug]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

McFarlane 'Mission', Israeli Redeployment Viewed H 1
[Seyful-Mulyukov]
PLO Central Council Session, Statement Cited H 1
USSR Envoy to Lebanon Tries To 'Mend' PLO Rift [Beirut] H 2
Kuwaiti Parliamentarians Continue USSR Visit H 2
[IZVESTIYA 30 Jul]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

U.S. Seeks To 'Internationalize' Chad Conflict J 1
[Demchenko in PRAVDA 5 Aug]
Libya 'Concerned' Over U.S. Actions in Area J 1
Results of Zaire's Mobutu Visit to U.S. Reviewed J 2
USSR, Zimbabwean Trade Unions Issue Statement J 3
Upper Volta Reported Calm Following Coup J 3

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Shultz Remarks Before Senate Committee Scored K 1
[Dmitriyev]
Start of 'Big Pine-2' Exercises Reported K 1
Nicaraguan Intelligence Chief Hits U.S. Actions K 2
[Gorbunov]
Ryabov Receives Nicaraguan Agriculture Minister K 2
[IZVESTIYA 30 Jul]
'Caribbean Initiative' Called 'Smokescreen' K 3
[Legantsov]
Changing Argentine Political Scene Examined
[Reznichenko in IZVESTIYA 22 Jul] K 3

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS


| | |
|---|---|
| Proceedings of CPSU Politburo Meeting Reported | R 1 |
| State, Party Resolutions on Labor Discipline | R 2 |
| Resolutions Detailed | R 3 |
| Ideological Work in Coming Academic Year [Editorial Article in PRAVDA 2 Aug] | R 6 |


SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS


| | |
|---|---|
| Cosmos-1487 Successfully Launched 5 Aug | U 1 |
| Updated Progress Report on Cosmonauts Program | U 1 |

WEST SEEN EVADING BASIC ARMS CONTROL QUESTIONS

PM051257 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Aug 83 First Edition p 4

[Article by political observer Yuriy Zhukov: "Reasonable Questions and False Answers"; passages in uppercase published in boldface]

[Text] These are hard times for the propaganda services of the United States and its NATO allies. They are no longer cheered by the hundreds of millions of dollars, pounds sterlin marks, and francs generously granted them, which give these services truly infinite potential for disseminating all over the world any inventions of their intrepid hired scribblers.

Agents of the U.S. and NATO political intelligence services report that these departments have proved incapable of convincing the Europeans that the Pershing II and cruise missiles which the Pentagon is preparing to deploy on their land are a great boon for them, for which they must be thankful day and night to a generous America. And they are failing altogether to prove to the stubborn Europeans that the USSR's counterproposals to this design -- proposals for a radical reduction in nuclear arms -- are dangerous and unacceptable.

The specialists in making fools of people wondered what to do, and it seemed to them that they had thought up a deft solution: It was necessary to gather together the questions being put by Europeans to U.S. and NATO propagandists and provide answers to them which would remove these restless peoples' desire to protest.

Of course, the tone of this latest propaganda campaign in defense of deploying new American nuclear facilities in West Europe was set by American specialists under the command of the garrulous Californian millionaire Charles Wick, who heads the USIA, a government agency. They compiled and published a brochure entitled "Intermediate-Range Nuclear Arms: Questions and Answers."

But what has happened? The brochure published by this agency will undoubtedly interest opponents of the deployment of American missiles in Europe. But...not because of the answers wrung out of the USIA, but because of the questions which it gathered together and which C. Wick's helpers circled around without being able to answer to the point.

Here are some of the statements by opponents of the nuclear arms race, with whom Mr Wick's specialists undertook to enter into polemics:

"You talk as though the Russians have not submitted any proposals at all. But in fact they have submitted several proposals. In December 1982, General Secretary Yu.V. Andropov declared that the Soviet Union is prepared to reduce the humber of its intermediate-range nuclear missiles to 162 units -- and, according to the Russians, Britain and France have that number of nuclear missiles -- if the NATO alliance abandons the deployment of intermediate-range nuclear forces. That seems reasonable."

"On 3 May, General Secretary Yu.V. Andropov declared that Moscow would consent to 'approximate equality between the USSR and NATO both in terms of carriers of medium-range nuclear weapons, that is, missiles and aircraft, and in terms of the number of warheads on them....' Is this not more than acceptable to the West?"

"Would it not be better for the European countries to refuse the deployment of intermediat range nuclear missiles so as not to become a potential target for a Soviet nuclear (counte strike?"

"Does all this talk of deterrence and of the number of missiles not ignore, in the final analysis, the important problem of the moral aspect of nuclear arms? For, after all, we are speaking of arms that are capable of wiping civilization off the face of the earth and killing millions of people...."

There is no denying the fact that all these questions are perfectly reasonable. Apart from everything else, they convincingly show that the members of antiwar movements who put such questions, not giving in to the monstrous slander campaign against the USSR, have still proved capable of assessing its proposals objectively. And now Wick's department must answer them. As the poet wrote, "Give us straight answers to damned questions."

Alas, the high-ranking specialists of this well-off department proved incapable of giving straight answers. When you familiarize yourself with the USIA specialists' arguments cited in the brochure, you are simply amazed at how pathetic they seem. Once again, judge for yourself:

Question: In what way do the plans to deploy in Europe nuclear missiles targeted on the Soviet Union help to strengthen European security?

Answer: In two ways -- first, by correcting the serious imbalance in arms (although everyone knows that equilibrium is now in evidence, and the deployment of 572 new American missiles would upset it! -- Yu. Zh.), which promotes potential military instability and could (?), in the event of a crisis, lead the Soviet Union into the temptation (!) of threatening West Europe....

Question: And what is the second way?

Answer: The planned deployment of ground-based Pershing II and cruise missiles creates for the Soviet Union a real and not theoretical incentive (!) to hold talks on substantial arms reductions....

One wonders: Who does Washington take Europeans for, by putting forward such apologies for arguments? Perhaps somewhere in the backwoods of remote corners of Olkahoma or Kansas, where information about the USSR has not reached for decades, some people would take this false bait. But in Europe?

And what is the worth of this dialogue:

Question: British and French missiles really exist, so why, then, does the United States refuse to take them into account?

Answer: At first glance the Russians' demands for the British and French nuclear forces to be included in the calculations sound valid, but they are a convenient means of justifying the establishment of unequal limits for American and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear arms systems....

Well I never! The Soviet Union publicly declares: We propose REDUCING medium-range nuclear facilities by hundreds of units, ensuring FULL EQUALITY between the USSR and NATO, including the United States, in terms of missiles, aircraft, and warheads, while Mr Wick's service declares that the USSR envisages "the establishment of UNEQUAL limits."

But this is still not everything. The brochure's authors go on to declare without batting an eyelid: "The British and French systems are independent strategic nuclear systems which exist for the defense of two sovereign countries," and therefore they bear no relation to NATO arms.

Come, come! American General Bernard Rogers, commander in chief, NATO allied armed forces, Europe, to whom the sophisms of Wick's service are alien, frankly stated a basic truth, as AP once reported. Addressing members of the Anglo-American Press Association in Paris, he said that in the event of a military conflict in Europe, France would "VERY QUICKLY" join its armed forces to those of NATO. "There exists... extremely close multilateral and bilateral cooperation with French military chiefs, which will yield fruit in any such confrontation," Gen Rogers specified.

Returning to this question in an 11 July interview for the Deutsche Welle radio station, FRG Defense Minister Manfred Woerner confirmed with full knowledge of the matter: In the event of an armed conflict "France will be on NATO's side in the very first seconds (!). There is no doubt at all about it." IN THE VERY FIRST SECONDS!

So, one wonders after this -- how, then, is it possible to forget about the French nuclear means when calculating the U.S. and NATO arms at the Geneva talks? Not to mention the nuclear arms of the government of Mrs Thatcher, who day after day swears Britain's loyalty to the NATO bloc. Incidentally, Britain's nuclear-powered submarines are equipped with American nuclear missiles.

Following Wick, on 14 July FRG Chancellor Kohl decided to try his luck in the question-and-answer game -- he granted an interview on the same subject and in the same spirit to the ARD television program. And again just the same discomfiture was repeated. The questions put to him by the ARD presenter were just as reasonable as those which the USIA specialists tried in vain to answer, and the answers to them were just as unconvincing.

Here is an eloquent excerpt from that dialogue:

Question: Mr Federal Chancellor, is it possible to prevent destruction? You have spoken of the possible end of the world....

Answer: Yes.

Question: Is it really possible to prevent the destruction of mankind by preparing for this destruction -- which is what we are now doing on an increasingly qualitative level? For this is the decisive question!

The chancellor evasively answered that he is in favor of "stopping this" and therefore advocates "continuing talks in Stockholm after the Madrid meeting" and "making use of every chance in Geneva." Then his interlocutor put the fundamental question point-blank:

"Do you think that the Russians want to attack us?"

This time, too, the chancellor avoided a direct answer and launched into arguments... about Afghanistan, but his interlocutor at once brought him back to the essence of the topic to which the broadcast was devoted.

"Surely, in the final analysis," he reminded the chancellor, "one cannot defend oneself with nuclear weapons. They are a means of mass destruction...."

The chancellor again brushed it aside:

"But there is certainly nothing new in the fact that we (not we -- the Americans, he corrected himself) possess nuclear weapons. The Americans have had the atom bomb since 1945, and the Soviet Union since approximately the end of 1950...."

Here the television broadcast drew to a close, and in the end no convincing answers had been given to the reasonable questions put to the FRG chancellor.

The "damned questions" of opponents of the nuclear arms race clearly deprive defenders of the deployment of new American missiles in Europe of their mental equilibrium. Of course, they secretly realize that their false answers will convince no one. Eloquent testimony of this is provided by the following dialogue from the same USIA brochure:

"Many people maintain that the necessary equilibrium in the category of intermediate-range nuclear systems already exists and that the deployment of the Pershing II and ground-based cruise missiles pursues the aim of ensuring military superiority for the NATO alliance," runs the argument of opponents of the deployment of these nuclear facilities in Europe, cited in this brochure.

What, then, did the gallant USIA specialists reply to this? Not even attempting to create a semblance of a reasoned argument, they made do with abuse:

"Rubbish! That can only be asserted by people who combine muddled arguments with vague formulas and with arbitrary manipulation of figures...."

No, there is no denying that these gentlemen are shouldering a thankless mission by taking on the impossible task of justifying tne U.S. Administration's aggressive policy with the help of more than dubious methods, for which they totally groundlessly rebuke others -- I mean "muddled arguments, vague formulas, and arbitrary manipulation of figures."

The question-and-answer game though up by apologists for U.S. imperialism as a blow against the antiwar movements in Europe is in fact working like a boomerang striking against themselves.

U.S. SPACE PLANS HOLD 'FIRST-STRIKE POTENTIAL'

PM051034 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 5

[P. Pavlov article: "Space: Washington's Words and Ambitions"]

[Text] They love to play with words in Washington, or to put it more simply, distort their true meaning, and by so doing hide behind purely "moble motives." At one time the White House, wanting to somehow conceal the aggressive nature of the war in Vietnam, used the word "advisers" instead of "armed forces" and "troops, training flight" instead of "bombing," and "pacification" instead of "annihilation." The invasion of a country situated many thousands of kilometers from the United States by the Pentagon's hordes was termed defense against "communist aggression."

Today in Washington they have decided to continue the "linguistic exercises" and hide behind fine words the unattractive nature of the Pentagon's latest dangerous adventure. In one speech the U.S. President called the plans to militarize space, which are unprecedented in scale and cost ... "a vision of peace inspiring hope for the future." In the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, F. Ikle, undersecretary of defense for policy, stated that it is a question of "carrying out supplementary military operations in space," and in the State Department the programs to develop an "antimissile weapon" are described as being purely "defensive," reflecting -- no more and no less! -- the White House's "concern" to maintain peace and prevent nuclear war!

The absurdity, of such claims, as well as their danger, is obvious. The beginning of the development of a large-scale ABM system is only one link in the present administration's extensive militarist program, the tone of which, as THE NEW YORK TIMES observes, is set by the President himself. The Pentagon's plans in the field of stockpiling strategic offensive weapons and deploying an "ABM" defense on the earth and in space -- plans with coordinated deadlines -- are aimed at completing in the eighties the creation of a so-called first-strike potential. This is the true meaning behind the Pentagon's feverish activity in near-earth space.

A precise and clear descrimption of the Pentagon's space aspirations is given in the joint statement by the participants in the Moscow meeting of leading party and state figures from socialist countries. This document regards the development of the space combat systems being implemented by the United States as a negative factor causing a worsening of the situation. The Pentagon's "development" of near-earth space is designed to disarm the Soviet Union in the face of the American nuclear threat.

However, the transatlantic "masters of linguistics," as we have seen, have their own notions of peace, as indeed they have of moral principles. R. Reagan's administration came to power noisily demanding a greater buildup of U.S. military might. Many of its leaders, including the President himself, claim that lessening tension in relations with the Russians is a "trap." To achieve their political goals, the American ruling circles have decided to make use of virtually every weapons system, including the so-called "ABM defense in the atmosphere," the total cost of which, according to U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, may reach the truly astronomical figure of $500 billion!

But the militarization of space is not just a question of economic excesses. This development of events, in the words of former Secretary of State C. Vance, "would undermine not only the security of other countries, but our own too." Why then in such a case should Washington begin a new "space" round in the arms race? For what purpose? "Any country," American Senator M. Wallop said some years ago, "which deploys 30 or so laser stations in space will be able to grant another state's missiles the privilege of using space, or refuse it." If this is achieved, M. Wallop emphasized, then the "strategic balance could be changed...." The American magazine BUSINESS WEEK was even more blunt: "Whoever is able to seize control of space, that main arena of future wars, will be able to change the correlation of forces decisively, and this will be tantamount to establishing world domination."

Feverish ideas of military superiority serve as a "sufficient reason" for Washington to revise everything positive that has been achieved with great difficulty in the field of restraining the arms race over the last decade. The creation of ABM weapons, many American congressmen, scientists, and specialists in the field of nuclear strategy observe, contradicts both the spirit and the letter of the 1972 treaty between the United States and the USSR on the limitation of ABM systems. Article 5 of this document forbids not only the deployment but even the development and testing of such a space-based system.

However, the United States is even now intensively developing various space weapons systems.

A version of a "space fighter-interceptor" based on the shuttle, which, according to the plans of the American military, will "inspect" and destroy an "enemy's" satellites, is being designed. In California the testing of the first experimental "beam" weapon installation is beginning.

The Pentagon plan codenamed "High Frontier" envisages the creation in space of several hundred satellites, each of which, the press maintains, will carry 40-50 missiles. Let us add to this that in the current year alone the U.S. Air Force space group is to spend more than $4 billion on developing, purchasing, launching, and maintaining the functioning of military systems in space. Just one of the leading military-industrial concerns, the American firm Rockwell International, recently received a long-term Pentagon contract to construct 28 military satellites. Martin Marietta, Lockheed, TRW, and others are already fulfilling multibillion dollar orders to create space weapons. Is this not why the American side is refusing to conduct negotiations on banning antisatellite systems? Is this not why the American President is suggesting to his people that such "science fiction" weapons are the only way to security? As far as the White House's assurances on peace and devotion to "defensive" concepts are concerned, in reality they turn out to be merely simple maneuvers, a new screen for the former course of the arms buildup and for attempts to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union at any price.

This policy will not, of course, bring success to the imperialists. The achievement of a military-strategic balance between socialism and capitalism is one of the most important results of recent decades and, as Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, has emphasized, "We will not allow it to be upset." History shows quite clearly that a policy based on a desire to achieve military superiority over the socialist countries is futile and is only likely to increase the threat of war. It is necessary to think not about protection against nuclear weapons, but about their limitation, reduction, and elimination.

The Soviet Union advocates a simple and reliable formula which creates a serious barrier to attempts to militarize space. The Soviet Union has proposed that an international treaty banning the deployment in space of any sort of weapon be concluded. Moreover, our country is prepared to come to an agreement on a complete ban on the use of force either in space or from space against the earth. The USSR's position receives the complete support of the socialist countries and the broad international public. As the participants in the Moscow meeting of leaders of fraternal socialist states stated, they consider it essential to begin as soon as possible talks on banning the deployment of any sort of weapons in space and on excluding the possibility of the arms race spreading to space.

This is the principled stand of our country. This is the guarantee of a peaceful future for mankind, about whose destiny the hypocrites from Washington mouth concern.

NUCLEAR FREEZE OFFER RENEWED ON A-BOMB DATE

LD071306 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 6 Aug 83

[Commentary by Professor Valentin Zorin, "leading commentator of Soviet television and radio"]

[Excerpts] Today mankind is observing one of the grimmest dates in its history, the start of the nuclear age. It is clear to anyone today that the decision to bomb Hiroshima and Nagasaki was taken by Washington not because it was warranted by the course of the Pacific campaign but because the then leaders of the United States decided to show the world their newly acquired might. It is also absolutely clear that the monstrous show of force, which claimed hundreds of thousands of lives, was aimed above all against the Soviet Union. This is not what the Americans are told today, nor is it what their children are taught at school. I could quote dozens of confessions in documents and the reminiscences of American politicians of the time which show what the objectives of the nuclear bombing of Japan really were.

I am saying it now not only to remind you of America's historic guilt, which Washington has never dared to acknowledge; I am saying it now because the issue in point is not merely the events that took place several decades ago but facts that bear directly on this day. Washington's entire propaganda machine is trying to demonstrate that America's unprecedented military efforts, costing the taxpayer hundreds of billions of dollars, are what is termed its response to Soviet moves. Washington claims that it is prepared to halt the arms race at any moment, but it is prevented from doing so by the Soviet Union, which is supposedly pressing for military supremacy and which allegedly is superior to the United States now.

Recalling 6 August 1945 now, we can answer the question of who started the arms race -- which has assumed a monstrous scale and claimed trillions of dollars -- without any sophistry and on the basis of solid facts. Facts show that it is the United States and not the Soviet Union that remains the initiator and the driving force of the arms race. The Soviet Union, as before, has to take measures in response. These measures led to a balance of forces between the two countries in the 70's. The fact that there is such a balance was acknowledged by three American presidents and was incorporated into a range of important agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States.

The present administration has decided to launch another spiral of the arms race and is trying to mislead public opinion at home that there is no balance now and that its moves are aimed at reaching a balance. However the administration has failed to furnish any facts to support its claims. The balance of forces in the world today has led millions of decent people throughout the world to accept the sober and logical idea that a first step towards saving mankind from nuclear war will be taken if the nuclear arsenals are frozen at their present level. Once a freeze is introduced it will be quite realistic to solve the problems of reducing these arsenals until no nuclear weapons are left on the face of earth. The idea is so simple and reasonable that it's been supported by hundreds of millions throughout the world, including, as numerous opinion polls in the United States show, a considerable majority of the Americans.

A comparison of the responses to the demand that nuclear weapons be frozen from Moscow and Washington is highly significant. By comparing the stands taken by the leaders of the two countries we can find out who is really responsible for the dangerous tension in the world today. Let us take a look at the facts. On 21 June the Soviet Government proposed to the government of the People's Republic of China that all nuclear powers should freeze the nuclear weapons they hold qualitatively and quantitatively. Initially this could be undertaken by the Soviet Union and the United States in the expectation that other nuclear powers would follow suit. I would like to underline that the issue in point is not a propaganda statement from a politician but an official proposal advanced by the Soviet Government.

A month and a half has passed since that proposal was put forward, but Washington has failed to respond to it officially, and this in spite of the fact that the idea of a nuclear freeze is supported by many Americans, that the world community supported the idea at the latest session of the United Nations General Assembly, and that a special resolution approving the mutual freezing of the nuclear potentials of the United States and the Soviet Union was passed by the House of Representatives of the United States Congress. Washington has ignored all this and it continues to stay silent about the Soviet initiative, thereby demonstrating its negative attitude toward it. I have already mentioned one of the so-called arguments in favor of such an unconstructive stand. The Pentagon claims that the freeze would perpetuate what it terms Soviet supremacy. In doing so the Pentagon turns a blind eye on the facts that show that the Soviet Union is in fact not superior to the United States, and ignores the tremendous overkill potential accumulated on the planet.

The nuclear weapons deployed today are more than enough to wipe out all life on earth and that makes it absolutely senseless to continue to build up nuclear weapons. Another claim of the opponents of a nuclear freeze is that it will be impossible to verify a nuclear freeze agreement. This claim does not hold water either, and this is acknowledged by many competent Americans, including the former Defense Secretary Mr Clifford, the former CIA chief, Mr Colby, and many others who know full well what the situation is really like. By refusing to discuss the Soviet proposals, ignoring United Nations resolutions and disregarding the sentiments of the international and American public the current leaders of the American Administration are assuming a grave responsibility to the world and pushing mankind to the brink of a nuclear precipice.

U.S. VOTE ON BINARY NERVE GAS PRODUCTION RAPPED

LD070306 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 6 Aug 83

[Text] A closed House-Senate conference last Wednesday decided to authorize production of a new generation of nerve gas. The decision was part of a lengthy debate concerning the 1984 military spending bill worth 200 billion dollars. We bring you a comment by observer Igor Dmitriyev.

Much is being said these days about the so-called unilateral American moratorium on the production of chemical arms introduced in 1969. This is being exploited to such an extent that one would believe the United States did nothing all these years. No. Don't jump for the conclusion. What the House-Senate conference authorized on Wednesday is not research and development but a fullscale production of a qualitatively new chemical weapon known as binary nerve gas. It consists of two components which become lethal only after they mix. The United States intends to produce binary bombs and shells. Any expert will tell you that it takes years to develop a new weapon. Chemical arms are no exception. Depending on a weapon system, research and development lasts from 4 to 6 years. On the average, outdated arms are replaced within a decade. This brings us very close to the 14 years of the alleged American inaction.

Another thing not mentioned by United States' propaganda in this connection is the political background of this period in general and the state of Soviet-American relations in particular. The early '70s saw an opening of Soviet-American contacts in many fields. One of them was a mutual effort to slow down the nuclear arms race. It was a painful time of reassessments which led to a series of agreements; they culiminated in the SALT I treaty. The two countries made new steps by starting SALT II talks and several sets of negotiations that included chemical arms. In fact Soviet-American talks on chemical arms started in 1976, aimed at working out the joint initiative to ban and eliminate them. Could the United States at that time give publicity to its work on binary nerve gas? Naturally, it could not. These talks were broken off by the American side in 1980. This was not coincidence. By that time it became perfectly clear that the Soviet-American treaty known as SALT II would never be ratified by Congress. In fact, at the end of 1979 the Carter administration already called for a fresh effort to build new and sophisticated weapons. It even proposed a basing mode for the MX missile which was not accepted. I mean the mode, not the missile.

Pacifists in the Pentagon in charge of chemical arms gave a sigh of relief when President Reagan announced a long-term program of rearming America. It was an across-the-board system, meaning that each and every component of the United States' Armed Forces was in for modernization -- conventional, strategic and medium-range, space, and, naturally, chemical. By doing nothing in the field of strategic weapons during almost the same period, as officials claim, the United States has managed to almost double the number of its nuclear warheads. By doing nothing for 14 years in the field of chemical arms, the United States has managed to produce binary nerve gas. It must be pure magic.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD071950 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 7 Aug 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program, with Aleksandr Bovin, Nikolay Shishlin, and Viktor Levin (participants not further identified)]

[Text] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrade radio listeners. The past week was notable for the anniversary of diametrically opposed events which reflect the main tendencies in international politics. For example, the atomic bombing of Hiroshima on 6 August 1945, and the signing 20 years ago of the Moscow treaty on banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and under water. The explosion of an atom bomb over Hirishima, this monstrous act perpetrated by American imperialism, was the expression of the hopes cherished by the most reactionary and, I would say, by the most adventurist circles in the United States to establish American-style peace under the shadow of the atomic mushroom. To this day Hiroshima remains the symbol of irresponsibility and thoughtlessness, the symbol of imperialist international terrorism.

The other anniversary, the anniversary of the signing of the Moscow treaty, and the concurrent eighth anniversary on 1 August of the signing in Helsinki of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, is evidence of realism and of understanding the necessity to adopt concrete measures toward preventing the threat of nuclear war. The spiritual heirs of those who dropped the atom bomb on Hiroshima now vest their foreign policy course with postulates stating that, as it were, there are things more important than peace. The author of this sadly notorious phrase was retired General Haig, who became secretary of state, and who was later sacked from the State Department. However, this same postulate to this day determines U.S. actions on the international arena.

## Arms Talks Stall

To this adventurist militarist course the Soviet Union and the other socialist community states oppose their consistent and purposeful policy of peace. At the recent CPSU Central Committee Politburo session it was emphasized with absolute clarity that there is, and there could be, no more important task than the preservation of stable peace. The main direction is to curb the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race. The task of the day is not to permit the occurrence of another Hiroshima, to prevent a new Euroshima. This is the spirit with which the Soviet Union approaches the Geneva talks on limiting nuclear armaments as well as the talks on limiting and reducing strategic armaments, the latest round of which was concluded last week.

[Bovin] So far, nothing positive can be said about either of these talks. The fourth round of the strategic armaments talks ended on 2 August, and now there is a recess until 5 October. On the whole, there has been no practical result. Still, there is a very interesting point to note -- the difference in the assessments given by us and by the Americans. When Karpov, the head of our delegation, was asked whether there were any results, he replied in a single word: No. But when Rowney, his main colocutor, was asked the same question, he launched into lengthy talk, which is generally typical of the Americans right now -- the closer the date of the presidential elections, the more they introduce an optimistic note in their speeches: Yes, there are difficulties, but we are hopeful, making progress, and so forth. They stress that heavily, and this is understandable. The reason is that Reagan has become aware that the belligerent stance may cost him dearly at the next elections. So he is trying, in the statements he makes, at least, to somehow adapt his position. Hence, as I said, this stream of rather artificial optimism, while in essence, I repeat, so far there are no grounds for such optimism.

This is because the Americans are not willing to change the main content of their position which asks, as we know, for a disproportionate reduction on the part of the Soviet Union of the basis of our strategic potential -- the land-based missiles. We shall never agree to that. So, as long as the Americans persist in their contention, it is hardly possible to hope for any positive outcome.

[Shishlin] The latest round in the talks was also notable for the fact that during its course the Americans made a broad advertisement of their so-called flexibility.

[Bovin] This flexibility was purely formal...

[Shishlin, interrupting] This flexibility turned out to be purely cosmetic, flexibility in words only. Then there is the other aspect of the matter: In the course of the talks the United States did not halt, even for a minute, the implementation of the large-scale military programs the White House is pushing through Congress. Therefore, to this day, there has been no forward movement at the talks.

But of course, there is also another problem. Talks are being held not only on strategic armaments, but also on limiting medium-range nuclear armaments in Europe. Although we have autumn practically on our doorstep, and the time is, as they say, five to midnight, while the deployment of American weapons has not taken place, an agreement is indeed possible. However, it is possible only if positive, energetic, and constructive actions at the talks, in the framework of the talks, are undertaken by both the Soviet and the American side.

[Levin] Of course, so far this cannot be said of the American position. The proposals which the United States is putting forward in Geneva are egotistical; their aim is that the United States should obtain unilateral advantages. It should be said that this was pointed out by Comrade Ustinov, marshal of the Soviet Union and USSR Minister of Defense, in his replies to questions from a TASS correspondent. This approach by the United States, this unequal approach, is what brings the talks to a dead end. The Americans are really engaged in quite a number of various political maneuvers intended to demonstrate that, as it were, they stand for flexibility, they stand for a constructive approach, and it is up to the Soviet Union to respond. But at the same time it must be admitted that this propagandist campaign is not producing any great effect. For instance, quite recently a very prominent politician in the FRG, retired General Bastian, openly stated that the Pershing II is a first-strike weapon and its deployment will intensify the threat of nuclear war. Such a realistic understanding of the situation will, of course, find expression in concrete actions, particularly during the "hot" autumn expected in West Europe.

[Shishlin] I would just say, Viktor Nikolayevich, that the term "hot autumn" is used to denote not only the antimissile and antinuclear movements. The autumn will be hot for the politicians and the diplomats too. Of course, the autumn will abound in very serious contacts and serious talks. And I repeat, it will be very important just what stance the United States will take.

[Bovin] Indeed, because generally speaking there is only one acceptable outcome, and it is a compromise. In a situation as complicated as this there can be different versions of compromise. What is important is to try and achieve it, rather than take up a position, as the United States has done, where it is generally unwilling to take into account our interests. The talks are there so that both our and the American interests should be taken into account. This is where the main difficulty lies. However, there are still a few more months ahead of us, especially with regard to Euroweapons. We shall hope that, despite everything, our partners will take a more serious look at the situation in Europe and in the whole world.

[Shishlin] Let me say that I agree with this thought. In principle it is inconceivable to reach an agreement which would prejudice the security interests of the Soviet Union, and, conversely, the security interests of the United States. In other words, there must be a line of equality; as in pulling a yoke, there must be an absolute balance. This balance must be sought.

[Levin] It is regrettable that the United States -- as you, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, quite justly noted -- is still trying at the Geneva talks and throughout the world, to dictate its will and conduct an imperial policy. This is exhibited very clearly now in Central America, and just as clearly in Africa by the events in Chad.

## U.S. Central American Stance

To begin with, I would like to draw attention to the events connected with Nicaragua. Quite recently, Secretary of State Shultz gave an interview to THE BALTIMORE SUN newspaper, whose correspondent asked: Could you not at least hint as to what kind of settlement in Nicaragua would be satisfactory for us, that is, the United States? Shultz not only made a hint but, with frankness quite unusual for a diplomat, he said in a concrete and direct way that the present government in Nicaragua does not satisfy the United States, and the United States wants it replaced.

[Bovin] I have recently noticed that if you compare the statements Reagan was making about Central America at the start of his presidency and his statements now, there is quite an interesting difference. I do not know if Reagan has grown wiser or if his advisers are putting pressure on him, but whereas before he just used to say that this was terrorism and the export of revolution, and leave it at that, he is now starting to argue along the lines that: Yes, they have economic and social difficulties there, and of course we must help to improve the life of the people. In other words, he is starting to attempt to present the United States as a power which is concerned about the well-being of the Central American peoples.

There is another aspect here however. The Americans are using the classical method of the carrot and the stick. The stick is obvious: American military aid here, advisers there, elsewhere the Navy goes in, maneuvers are held. Our listeners will be well aware of all this. But there is another side to the coin. Take Richard Stone, for instance, who has been appointed Reagan's special representative for Central America. He has recently been meeting with various government representatives, and a few days ago in Bogota -- in the presence of a mediator, President Betancur of Colombia; this happened in his office, in his palace -- he actually met Ruben Zamora, one of the leaders of the Revolutionary Democratic Front [of El Salvador]. This is indicative of the tactics that the Americans are attempting to pursue. The talks took place behind closed doors, and neither Zamora nor Stone spoke about their contents. Zamora did stress that on this occasion they talked about the fact that these contacts should be continued without an agenda, on a wide range of issues. In essence it is evident that Stone was trying to persuade Zamora that the insurgents should participate in the elections being planned in El Salvador; the representatives of the revolutionary movements are refusing, saying that this is too narrow a formulation of the issues and that the overall settlement of the political situation in El Salvador must be discussed. There is another very interesting nuance here illustrating the carrot rather than the stick. President Magana of El Salvador has set up a so-called peace commission, comprising a number of people authorized to hold talks with representatives of the insurgent movements. Thus there is this other aspect of the problem: The Americans are, on the one hand, making this attempt to foist their views by military force, and on the other they are attempting -- taking public opinion into account, taking into account the situation which is arising in Central America -- to act in other ways too. One must consider both these aspects.

[Shishlin] It also seems to me that there is another very interesting side to this whole problem. On the one hand, as we have already said, there is the massive pressure and force that the United States is bringing to bear on the whole of this Central American region, above all Nicaragua. On the other hand, there is the following element in the whole of this situation -- growing misgivings inside America itself as to whether the Reagan administration might not take the United States...

[Bovin, interrupting] Into a new Vietnam.

[Shishlin]...so far that a new Vietnam may arise. Moreover, these protests in the United States are quite widespread. For instance, as far as we know, a closed session of Congress passed a resolution prohibiting secret aid for the Nicaraguan rebels from the Reagan administration.

[Bovin] A group of Congressmen forwarded a motion barring Reagan from holding maneuvers without Congress' assent.

[Shishlin] Viktor Nikolayevich earlier quoted U.S. Secretary of State Shultz. What we have is three secretaries of state, albeit former ones -- Rusk, Vance, and Muskie -- joined by McNamara, former secretary for defense, and Bundy, a former presidential assistant to Johnson and Kennedy. They made a very alarming statement to the effect that Reagan is drawing the United States into war in Central America.

[Bovin] Incidentally, Kissinger has sprung up in this soil, so to speak, because the President, attempting to secure support in Congress, has formed a bipartisan commission for Latin America, and Henry Kissinger, someone we all know well, has been appointed commission chairman.

[Shishlin] This is what occurs to me. Every now and again in the United States they trot out the story that it is inadmissible for Central America to become a zone of conflict between East and West. Well, it is quite clear who is meant by East and who is meant by West. In fact, Central America is already becoming a definite arena of conflict between the views of the administration and those of the Europeans, the Social Democrats. There is dissatisfaction here, and more than that, there are sharp protests against American policy. They are growing everywhere, not just in the socialist world, which naturally stands up against this crude and imperialist conduct.

[Levin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, I would like to bring in some specific facts to back up your sentiments. THE WASHINGTON POST has published the results of an opinion poll on the Reagan administration's policy in Central America. They are very telling results. By a proportion of 54 percent to 29, people said that Reagan is leading the United States into military interference in Central America. Sixty-two percent of Americans taking part in the poll declared that they do not approve of any U.S. involvement in the toppling of the Nicaraguan government.

A very caustic article on Reagan was published the other day by Reston. The drift was that when the President does not meddle very actively in politics, then politics do not go badly, but as soon as he starts being too active, all sorts of problems arise.

[Bovin] Reston advises him to take more time off.

[Levin] Yes, to rest on his ranch, as his wife Nancy advises! That is precisely what Reston proposes that he should do. But in Western Europe there is very great concern. THE NEW YORK TIMES sums it up as follows: So far neither these misgivings over Reagan's policy in Central America nor the protests have taken precise shape.

Nothing yet resembles the continuous protests which accompanied American intervention in Indochina. In certain West European capitals, however, officials fear that a military conflict in Central America could pose acute new problems for NATO. Gunboat diplomacy, leading from threats to the use of force, would in all evidence entail fresh protest demonstrations, and would sharpen the question, remaining in the focus of attention, as to whether the Reagan administration can be entrusted with leadership in the international arena. In other words, what is involved again are doubts over the general natur of the Reagan administration's actions in the world, and in this respect Central America could serve as a catalyst of such sentiments.

What is the way out of the situation? The way out is indicated very clearly by a whole series of Latin American states; it is indicated by Cuba: A political solution to the problem, a solution to the problem which takes account of the legitimate and just interests of the countries and peoples of the region. It is interesting, by the way, once again, that the Americans -- the American Administration -- are now generally reacting quite positively in their statements to the initiative of the Contadora Group, and even to Fidel Castro's statements. They are saying: Yes, there is something there. Nevertheless, muscle is clearly taking the upper hand over reason so far. The unprecedented concentration of American military might in Central America, it seems to me, is still the principal method employed by the United States to pursue its policies in the region.

## Chad Examined

While one can say that Central America is close to the United States and that they are manifesting great anxiety over developments in the region, one could not say that Chad was nearby. However, actions taken by the United States are similar in nature.

[Bovin] Yes, the situation in Chad is fairly complex. You know, comrades, in effect, a civil war has been in progress there since 1966. Generally speaking the country is remote and backward. It is probably one of the most backward countries in the world. It has a population of only 3.5 million people. But compare its size with that of France. It is two-and-a-half times as big as its former parent state. And the country is not homogenous. The main dividing line, so to speak, of this animosity passed -- and passes -- between the Arab, Islamic north and, gnerally speaking, the south, where Christian tribes and all sorts of heathen tribes live. Chad is a kind of dividing line between, on the one hand, white Africa and, on the other, black Africa. Between, for example, the desert and the savannah. When Chad first received independence, the government was mostly made up of representatives of the south. The uprising was begun in the north by the Islamic Arab elements which demanded equal representation in the government. Then the wheel started turning.

[Shishlin] I would just like to add one point. As it happens, the people who now personnify the conflict -- Hissein Habre in Ndjamena, and Goukouni Oueddei -- both belong to one and the same black, Muslim tribe.

[Bovin] Yes. Together they organized the liberation front, Frolinat [Chadian National Liberation Front], from which Habre was expelled in 1976. That was when the split between him and Goukouni Oueddei and the main fighting between them started. A whole series of agreements of various kinds were reached. Many African countries took part in attempts to reconcile them, to unite them, to create a coalition government including the various groupings. There were many such attempts. But in the end they all failed. Ignoring all the fine distinctions, the final alignment of forces is roughly as follows: On the one hand there is Hissein Habre and his grouping, which gravitates toward France, and toward the West in general. On the other hand there is a grouping, the former Goukouni Oueddei government, which maintains friendly relations with Libya and relies on Libyan assistance.

It is this Libyan connection which serves as the formal excuse to which France, the United States, and Zaire refer when they take Habre's side. In other words, their position is as follows: Libya must not be allowed to spread its political influence to the center of the African Continent. That is the position of the West and the position of Habre.

[Shishlin] Our Soviet position is that we consider that Chad's sovereignty, its right to take independent decisions, and the sovereignty of its territory, must be strictly respected by all sides. Our position is that the internecine warfare in Chad would be ended infinitely more quickly if it were not for foreign interference in these affairs.

[Bovin] But the Americans have already supplied Habre with military equipment worth $7 million.

[Levin] In only 2 weeks.

[Bovin] Yes, the total amount will be $10 million, with equipment worth $7 million having already been delivered. The French are also taking an active part. There are 1,800 soldiers from Zaire there on Habre's side. The Americans are moving their Sixth Fleet up to the shores of Libya in order to put pressure on Libya. However, Libya categorically asserts that it is not participating in the hostilities in Chad and that it is maintaining a strict neutrality. The other day the Libyan Government invited an OAU mission to visit Libya in order to see for itself -- on the spot, so to speak -- that Libya is not taking part in these hostilities. Of course it is advantageous for Habre to exploit this trump card. He is trying as hard as he can to rely on Western support, claiming that he will be the bastion which will prevent the penetration of radical ideas to the center of Africa.

[Shishlin] Military advisers are already gradually appearing there; there are six from the United States.

[Bovin] Yes, but clearly there are some misunderstandings here because U.S. newspapers have begun saying that the Americans will teach the French to use U.S. antiaircraft missiles there. A denial that anything of the kind would happen was immediately issued by Paris. But there is another interesting detail here. The Americans are all the time stressing the fact that they are constantly consulting France, yet in Paris this allusion to constant consultations with America is played right down. In my view this also helps to a certain extent toward an understanding of the alignment of forces in Chad. The French are, of course, hesitating a little at the moment because it is quite obvious that the Americans are far from lacking a motive for their busy behavior in Chad. The Americans want to secure some bases for themselves in Central Africa, and to squeeze out France, which had traditionally enjoyed political influence there. Paris is very well aware of this, so that nuance also has to be considered.

[Levin] The newspaper LIBERATION wrote that the United States wants to use the Chad conflict as a pretext to expand its political maneuvers against Libya and intends to draw France into this crusade. But France, as LIBERATION asserts, is not prepared to manifest such an inclination...

[Bovin, interrupting] LIBERATION is being a little modest, so to speak. France is prepared to manifest such an inclination and is now doing so actively.

[Shishlin] As it happens, France has to be given first place among those giving military assistance to Habre.

[Levin] But I think the French are still making some attempt to distance themselves from the United States.

[Bovin] Unquestionably they are, because the United States has such a stained reputation that from the point of view of public opinion it is, of course, more advantageous to keep one's distance from it.

[Levin] In this respect I think that the visit by Cheysson, the French minister of external relations, to a number of Latin American states, which culminated in a trip to Cuba, was certainly not unconnected with events concerning Chad, even though it was directly connected with the events in Central America. You will agree that the arrival in Havana at this time of the French minister in charge of foreign policy is an action which does not bring much pleasure to the Americans, irrespective of the outcome of the talks.

[Bovin] If I were to try to draw some general conclusions about current French policy, I would say that on essential matters, on very many important questions of world policy, France makes common cause with the United States. Nevertheless, it is trying in all ways possible to demonstrate its independent policy by making all kinds of gestures, including the visit by Cheysson to Cuba.

[Levin] Meanwhile the Chad situation is becoming increasingly tense, and, of course, those threats against Libya are a new stage in the escalation of the tension. In this respect I think that the fact that Reagan promised to give further assistance to Chad when he received Zairean President Mobutu Sese Seko at the White House last Thursday is a cause for concern. He did not disclose what was envisaged, but it is clear that U.S. interference will increase. At the same time Reagan lavished praise on Mobutu for his courageous action, namely the dispatch of soldiers to Chad. But I think that these talks were between people who are more directly connected with each other than through Habre. The following curious detail has emerged, for example. Mobutu's troops in Chad are being paid with money made available by the United States. Although this is being done through the Habre regime, it is really a direct expression of the wishes of U.S. imperialist polic

[Shishlin] Viktor Nikolayevich, the moralists in the present Washington administration are very fond of talking about a code of behavior, of teaching other people about the code of behavior to be adhered to in international affairs. As it happens, U.S. actions are wholly out of keeping with this code of behavior. This interference in the internal affair of other peoples unquestionably poisons international relations.

[Bovin] As the old saying goes, I think, they should practice what they preach!

[Levin] The events are indeed very complex. But, as we have already said, such landmarks in the development of international relations as the signing of the Helsinki Final Act and the Moscow Treaty show that realistic trends are nevertheless very powerful, and manifest themselves very strikingly in international politics. Even now they are making themselves felt in the sharp criticism of Reagan's course in Central America and Chad. So, although we will not try to predict the further development of events just now, we are firmly confident that realism is bound to gain the upper hand over recklessness.

The time allotted for our program has run out. Thank you for your attention, esteemed comrades. All the best.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS & ANSWERS'

LD052221 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 5 Aug 83

["International Situation: Questions and Answers" program presented by Igor Surguchev (not further identified), with international affairs journalist Eduard Vasilyevich Kovalev, international affairs journalist Igor Petrovich Belyayev, and Candidate of Histor Konstantin Ivanovich Semenov]

Nuclear-Free Zones

[Excerpts] [Surguchev] (Boris Petrovich Gernovyy) from Zaporozhye is interested in the problem of nuclear-free zones.

In his letter he asks: Is there any international agreement on nuclear-free zones or is the concept of these zones only a rhetorical one at the moment? I shall ask Eduard Vasilyevich Kovalev, international affairs journalist, to answer our listener. Over to you Eduard Vasilyevich.

[Kovalev] In Europe the question of forming a nuclear-free zone has been a ripe one for a long time. It is becoming more and more topical. Ever since nuclear weapons first appeared, the Soviet Union has ascribed special importance to the prevention of nuclear confrontation between the blocs, above all in areas where it could be especially dangerous. Europe, first and foremost central Europe, is undoubtedly such an area. It is no coincidence that the first drafts for nuclear-free zones, which appeared a quarter of a century ago, were intended precisely for central Europe. These proposals by our country, by the countries of the Warsaw Treaty, were rejected by the NATO countries at that time.

But this idea did not die. It remains and is making headway even now. Let us recall that in 1963 Finland put forward an initiative for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe. The significance of this proposal has now become even greater in view of the forthcoming deployment of new U.S. medium-range missiles on the territory of a number of NATO member-states. Although the members of the Atlantic bloc in northern Europe, Norway, and Denmark have renounced in a fairly binding form the deployment of nuclear weapons in their countries duirng peacetime, the Pentagon and the U.S. Administration are planning to make use of those countries' airports in a crisis situation for basing nuclear-weapon-carrying bombers. One should also take account of the fact that the envisaged flight trajectory of U.S. cruise missiles to be deployed in the British Isles would take them over not only the territory of NATO member-states, but also over Sweden and Finland.

The Soviet Union continues to regard the Finnish idea as being very constructive and promising. We are willing to conclude both a multilateral agreement with the countries forming such a zone and bilateral agreements with each individual country involved. Naturally the participants in the zone would have greater security if they were also to receive a guarantee of respect for their non-nuclear status from the NATO nuclear power. In the creation of a north European nuclear-free zone, the Soviet Union does not exclude the implementation of certain measures on its own territory. Moreover, it could be a question of substantial measures. The Soviet concept of military detente for Europe regards the creation of the continent of zones free of nuclear weapons as one of the ways of attaining a peaceful, nuclear-free Europe.

We support the idea put forward by the Balkan states, also a few years ago, for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans. Quite recently Greece put forward its own concept for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans. Romania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and, finally, Turkey have given a positive response to this Greek proposal. One should also note the great and positive role being played by Bulgaria, which is an active supporter of a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans and which is working hard to bring it about.

[Surguchev] What can one say, Eduard Vasilyevich, about the recent Swedish Government statement in favor of declaring central Europe to be a nuclear-free zone?

[Kovalev] Our reply to the Swedish Government note said that this proposal by Sweden was a move in the same direction as the endeavors of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states. Sweden proposed the creation of a zone to be free of battlefield nuclear weapons, a zone which would be 300 kms wide. In their reply to this initiative the socialist countries and the Soviet Union proposed that this zone be extended to 500-600 kms.

Clearly, the broader the proposed zone, the less the nuclear danger will be. The Swedish proposal also encountered a positive assessment from the West European public. However, the governments of the NATO countries are not happy with this Swedish proposal. They consider that this is not a subject for discussion, as FRG Chancellor Kohl put it.

[Surguchev] Why? After all, the Swedish proposal presents an opportunity to discuss a question which worries the peoples of Europe but which has nevertheless not yet been discussed -- the question of battlefield nuclear weapons, in other words, tactical nulcear weapons.

[Kovalev] We feel that the reason is that the Pentagon and NATO do not wish to part with any nuclear weapons, whether medium-range or tactical weapons. In our view the creation of regional nuclear-free zones could only facilitate a global solution of the problem of limiting the arms race, the problem of disarmament and establishing lasting peace, both in Europe and throughout the world. Postwar experience of international relations in Europe and throughout the world shows that the idea of establishing nuclear-free zones is far from being a hopeless venture, a quixotic dream or a utopia. This concept is alive in spite of all the attempts to undermine confidence in it, to consign it to oblivion.

## Syria, Mideast Discussed

[Surguchev] The authors of a number of letters, including Comrades (Aganin) from Vologda, and (Tyutrin) from Orekovo-Zuyevo asked for an explanation of the attitude of Syria in relation to the Lebanon-Israel so-called peace agreement, and in particular why it refuses to withdraw its troops from Lebanon. These comrades are also interested in the nature of the disagreements which have arisen in the Palestinian opposition movement. Igor Petrovich Belyayev, journalist of international affairs, replies to these questions. Over to you, Igor Petrovich:

[Belyayev] Syria rejects the Israeli-American-Lebanese peace agreement, the word peace being in inverted commas, of course. This is primarily because Israeli is the aggressor. Israel attacked an independent Arab country and carried out on Lebanese territory numerous military crimes by the Israeli army and crimes against humanity, as is now known to the whole world. These crimes should be punished, but according to the agreement, Israel is being treated as a country equal to Syria and to all other countries drawn into the Near East conflict, and as far as I see it, taking account of the unfairness (protivopravnost) of the Israeli-American-Lebanese agreement -- for it was concluded in extreme conditions, essentially under the threat of an expansion of the Israeli occupation at a time when the Israeli army was on the territory of an independent state -- naturally, in these conditons Syria and Israel must not be placed on the same footing. I repeat: Israelis the aggressor.

Syria is a fraternal Arab country whose troops are on the territory of Lebanon by mandate of the council of the Arab League. Usually people retort that the mandate expired on 26 July last year. Yes, indeed, the term of the mandate for the stay of Syrian forces on Lebanese territory has expired. But the mandate has not been annulled. Apart from anything else, from the military point of view the Syrians consider that the Al-Biqa' Valley is a sort of strategic cover for Damascus and other vitally important centers of the Syrian Arab Republic, and therefore Syria does not at present intend to withdraw its troops from that part of Lebanon, for there it is protecting the independence of Lebanon, as Syrian politicians say, and its own security.

It seems to me that there is yet another consideration worthy of attention. This consideration is connected with the fact that Syria, as an Arab state which is in favor of a just Near East settlement, in essence is now the only Arab country which is opposing Israeli military pressure. This position of Syria is now supported by all in the Arab world who are against Israeli aggression, and against American imperialism, which is supporting Israeli aggression.

The United States is disposing some Arab states against Syria, asserting that there are only two ways out of the current situation -- the withdrawal of Syrian troops from Lebanon, or the partition of Lebanon. But after all, esteemed listeners, the partition of Lebanon has already virtually been completed, for the Israeli army is redeploying to the south and is basing itself, for a long time if not forever, on territory south of the Lebanese town of Sidon. This means that the dismemberment of Lebanon has already started. Naturally Syria will continue to take a stance amounting to opposing Israeli aggression, against the complicity of the United States in this aggression. It will continue to defend the Arabs' cause.

Now a few words about the position of the Palestinian resistance movement. Unfortunately, reports continue coming in about clashes between various factions in that movement, especially in the Al-Biqa' Valley where supporters and opponents of Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee, are not only using weapons against each other, but are also taking part in clashes on a broader scale, so to speak. The skirmishes between his supporters and opponents in the Al-Biqa' Valley are deplorable. Internecine strife today will not promote the consolidation of the forces of the Palestinian resistance movement, and, objectively, serve the interests of Israel and the United States. What is it about? Why have there appeared supporters and opponents of 'Arafat in the Palestinian resistance movement. After all, quite recently this movement was as one.

What is certain is that some of the politicians and military men in such a Palestinian resistance movement organization as Fatah considered that following the events in Lebanon it was essential to conduct a purely armed struggle against Israeli aggression, or at least to refuse diplomatic efforts, viewed as some part of the political struggle. In their view the course had already been marked out for achieving, with the aid of Jordan, some sort of accord with the Americans, and through them with Israel also. After the talks between Yasir 'Arafat and King Husayn in Amman, which were held not so long ago, those who were against 'Arafat declared that this was a plot, a plot in favor of Israel, a plot in favor of the United States. It seems to me that the very latest events -- although skirmishes are continuing between 'Arafat supporters and opponents -- have brought a certain clarity. I think that today there will be less people who doubt that Yasir 'Arafat is conducting the correct political line and is fighting not to allow a plot with those who would like to break up the Palestinian resistance movement from within. In the near future those who today do not want peace within the Palestinian resistance movement will be in the minority. Internecine strife will cease and the movement will again acquire its fighting form.

## Latin America Reviewed

[Surguchev] Petr Maksimovich Khokhlov, from Minsk, asks why it is that quite recently most reports from Central America concerned El Salvador, the struggle of the partisans and the participation of U.S. instructors in the fighting on the side of government troops. Now, he says, the events have shifted to Nicaragua, to the area of the Nicaraguan-Honduran border. It is reported that a large number of U.S. warships are in the Caribbean Sea, threatening Nicaragua and Cuba.

Yes, Petr Maksimovich, you are right. The main attention of the world public and the press has moved to Nicaragua, which has become the object of threats and military blackmail on the part of the Reagan administration. It is not that events in El Salvador have diminished. Far from it. The Parabundo Marti National Liberation Front is continuing successful combat operations there and controls wide parts of the national territory. It is simply that Washington has somewhat reviewed its strategic plans in this area, or to be more precise, has fully disclosed its real intentions. American geopoliticans consider that with the coming to power of people's governments in Nicaragua and Grenada there has arisen in the Caribbean region a supposed communist threat to U.S. interests.

This is a known idea of Reagan and his advisers: View any regional conflict in the light of confrontation between West and East. That is why Washington has concentrated its attacks on Nicaragua.

Previously the American President had explained his military interference in the affairs of the region and his aid to the reactionary Salvadoran regime by the fact that Nicaragua and Cuba were allegedly inspiring the partisan struggle in that country and were sending arms there. Now Reagan puts the matter somewhat differently. He demands no more, nor less, than the restoration of democracy in Nicaragua. What sort of democracy the White House boss favors can be judged from which regimes in Latin America are his best friends. They are the antipopular clique in El Salvador; the dictator of Chile, Pinochet; the dictator Stroessner in Paraguay, who has been in power for about 30 years; Duvalier, Junior in Haiti. This is the sort of democracy that the U.S. President wants to present as a gift to the people of Nicaragua. Or perhaps it will be the democracy of the local model, of the type which existed there before the revolution. There are even advocates of this. It is known that over 10,000 former guards of the dictator Somoza, trained and equipped by the United States, are ready to invade Nicaragua from Honduras. What is more, they are already carrying out bandit operations against that country. Naturally, neither the people of Nicaragua, nor the Sandinista Government will ever agree to Washington's ridiculous demands. In presenting clearly unacceptable conditions, the White House wishes thereby to convince public opinion that it is not possible to reach agreement with the Sandinistas, as it were.

Meanwhile, the Nicaraguan Government has put forward concrete plan for a peaceful settlement to the Central American problems, including the Nicaraguan-Honduran conflict. It coincides with the proposals raised by the former Latin American countries of Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and Panama, which are acting as mediators. In El Salvador the national patriotic forces are also agreeable to cease combat actions and to discuss with the government plans for a new state structure in the country. But without the mediation efforts of the United States, since the latter are taking part in the Salvadoran conflict on the side of the government troops. In this case, what sort of U.S. objectivity can we talk about? In a word, the Central American countries are ready to continue seeking a peaceful solution to their problems and quarrels. The United States, however, is stepping up its blatant interference in the affairs of the region; it is resorting to blackmail and intimidation of sovereign states, which is shown yet again by the sending of the American naval armada to the Caribbean, toward the cost of Nicaragua and Cuba.

U.S.-Japanese Alliance

[Surguchev] (Ilya Filippovich Kapayev) has sent us a letter from the town of Kemerovo. He recalls that the Japanese people are the only people in the world to have suffered atomic bombing. Over 300,000 civilians perished at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, victims of the U.S. military which deliberately carried out the mass killing of completely innocent people. Why, the author of the letter asks, did Japan opt for a military alliance with the United States?

In 1960 Japan concluded an agreement on joint defense with the United States, an agreement known as the Security Treaty. This document was the basis of the military-political process by which Tokyo is no longer merely abetting Washington's anti-Soviet strategy, but is increasingly becoming a direct accomplice in it. Having adopted a policy of sharply intensifying the country's militarization, Japan's ruling circles have been and are carrying out a daily brainwashing of the population in the spirit of nationalism and the samurais. Calls are being made for the restoration of Japan's national honor, which they say was lost during the last war. A characteristic feature of this propaganda campaign is that it is imbued with rabid anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. Open attempts are made to sow seeds of enmity toward the USSR, especially among the young generation.

It would be a mistake to consider that the propaganda concoctions do not have an impact on the consciousness of a certain part of the Japanese population. A carefully thought out and refined policy of poisoning the mind of the Japanese man-in-the-street has resulted in a certain erosion of antiwar feelings on the Japanese Islands. This is realized by progressive forces in Japan. Therefore they are rallying their ranks, full of determination to struggle against a policy which is ruinous for the country's national interests, and against the sinister military alliance with the United States.

U.S. Scandal

[Surguchev] Muscovite (Larionova) asks whether the United States has a law under which the President can be deprived of his powers before the end of his term of office if his policy does not justify the hopes of the voters. We will reply to this question. There is no such law in the United States. There is also no provision for the holding of early presidential elections if public opinion polls show a sharp fall in the population's support for the policy of the head of state. Therefore, during his 4-year term of office the President can ignore both the wishes of the electors and his own election promises. Public dissatisfaction with the President's political course does not threaten the occupant of the White House with the loss of the presidential chair.

However, the U.S. Constitution does allow for the removal of a President from power before the end of his term of office under a procedure known as impeachment. Only the country's supreme legislative body, the Congress, can resort to this procedure. Impeachment is a special judicial measure which can be applied against top officials of the state charged with treason against the state, anticonstitutional actions, criminal offenses, or serious misconduct.

You probably remember, comrade listeners, that it was precisely because of the threat of impeachment that the Republican Richard Nixon was forced to leave the White House in 1974 before the end of his term. He was found to be involved in the major Watergate scandal which flared up in 1972 over illegal entry to the headquarters of the Democratic Party and the planting of bugging devices.

As you know, a fresh scandal of a similar nature has now broken out in the United States. It is connected to the theft by members of President Reagan's entourage of important documents from the Carter camp. It is considered that the theft of these documents significantly helped Reagan to gain the upper hand over Carter during the 1980 elections. The investigation of this unseemly business, which is a graphic reflection of the mores prevalent in Washington's corridors of power, is continuing. At the moment it is difficult to say what the outcome of the investigation will be. The progress of the investigation interests our listeners. Therefore I have asked our New York correspondent, Yevgeniy Petko, to talk about how the investigation is going:

[Begin recording] A whole series of government bodies are now trying to establish evidence that an offense against the law was committed by Reagan's supporters, to find the culprits, and to determine the degree of guilt. The investigation is creaking along unbelievably slowly. It has marked time for over a month now, even though the FBI, the Department of Justice, and the Select Committee on Human Resources and Ethics of the U.S. Congress -- such a body does exist -- are taking part. The Congressional select committee, which has only four members and lacks experience in such matters, is having great difficulty even in obtaining full access to indispensable documents. Many people openly doubt the ability of government bodies to objectively investigate an affair in which the CIA director, members of the cabinet, and presidential aides are involved. The supporters of the Democratic Party are demanding the holding of a painstaking investigation and the punishment of the culprits. However, in my view there is no unanimous line among them on the course of action which should be taken, having regard to the interests of the new presidential elections which are approaching.

In this situation the present leaders of the Democratic Party and the former President himself will not be able to lodge any serious claims before the investigation is completed. [end recording]

[Surguchev] As a footnote to our correspondent's report I shall note that former President Carter is not taking part in the investigation. So far he has even refrained from making any accusations against officials of the Republican administration who are mixed up in the scandal. That was a reply to a queetion received from Comrade (Kirnas) in Moscow.

SOVIET DELEGATE ADDRESSES CONFERENCE ON RACISM

LD021758 Moscow TASS in English 1619 GMT 2 Aug 83

[Text] Geneva August 2 TASS -- The general discussion has started at the 2nd World Conference on Struggle Against Racism and Racial Discrimination. Speaking at the plenary meeting today, the head of the Soviet delegation Aleksandr Dzasokhov read out a message from the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Council of Ministers of the USSR to the participants in the conference. He noted that such mainstays of the nationalities policy as the equality and sovereignty of peoples, the abolition of all and every racial and national privileges and restrictions were proclaimed already at the moment of the formation of the Soviet state. Relations of friendship of peoples without precedent in history have formed in the USSR. The Soviet state, the speaker went on, in the international arena, too, resolutely and consistently comes out against racial and national segregation and discrimination. It was on the initiative of the USSR that the United Nations adopted such documents as the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, the declaration on the liquidation of all forms of racial discrimination, etc.

The head of the Soviet delegation noted further that, despite the big successes of the national-liberation struggle of the peoples, colonialism and racism still remain a dangerous source of tension and conflicts. By pursuing a policy of direct military pressure, economic blackmail, and interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states, the imperialist circles are counteracting the national-liberation struggle of the peoples. The racist regime of the Republic of South Africa, which cruelly oppresses the native population of its country and the people of Namibia, is the shock force of imperialism in the African Continent. Israel has set up a regime of discrimination and cruel repressions in respect of the Arab population. The growth of racist sentiments and of manifestations of discrimination in a whole number of Western countries also gives rise to great concern. Mankind do not want to put up with the existence of racism, apartheid, and racial discrimination, the head of the Soviet delegation said in conclusion. The participants in the conference can and must make a worthy contribution to the cause of ensuring peace and security, and this is the main demand of the epoch, the road to the full liquidation of racism and racial discrimination.

India's State Minister of External Affairs A.A. Rahim said it was insufferable that in the Republic of South Africa 20 percent of the white population were ruling 80 percent of the coloured population as though they were slaves, herding them into Bantustans and dooming them to terrible unemployment, hunger, and poverty. The similar regime of cruel oppression exists in Namibia as well. At the time when the world community is pressing for the liquidation of the regime of apartheid, he said, some states are giving assistance to the Republic of South Africa. A.A. Rahim also condemned Israel's policy in the occupied Arab lands. How can it be tolerated that a whole people, the Palestinians, are denied their land, their right to their homeland? He queried. The Indian representative called for political and moral solidarity with the peoples struggling for liberation from racist oppression, for assistance to them and to national-liberation movements. He read out a message from the Prime Minister of India Indira Gandhi which stresses the importance of the conference and the tasks of liquidating racism.

## REAGAN CALL FOR FREER TRADE 'HYPOCRITICAL'

LD071530 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0950 GMT 7 Aug 83

[Text] Washington, 7 Aug (TASS) -- President R. Reagan's latest radio broadcast amounted to hypocritical attempts to defend Washington's approach to international trade. With declarations to the effect that trade is "a powerful force of progress and peace" and that it promotes growth of other countries' economies, he attempted to camouflage the indisputable fact that the policies of his administration pursue exactly the opposite ends and that they are based on flouting the interests of other countries, diktat, and blackmail.

In his remarks, for instance, Reagan advocated "freer trade" and said that at the recent conference of leaders and heads of state and government of the seven major capitalist states in Williamsburg (Virginia), the participants pledged to promote the creation of a "more open trade system." But immediately after the Williamsburg meeting Washington demonstrated that it did not intend to take into account either the agreements or its own partners. This was shown, in particular, by a decree recently signed by the President imposing tough restrictive quotas and tariffs on imports into the United States of certain types of steel, the main suppliers of which are Western Europe and Japan, and by his decision to raise the duty on potatoes imported from Canada.

Another illustration of the Reagan administration's total disregard for the interests of its trade partners is its egoistic fiscal policy, the latest manifestation of which was the sharp rise in the rate of the dollar on the Western exchanges over the last few days. Washington's strategy, as the French L'HUMANITE said in this connection, "is based above all on keeping the rate of the dollar artificially high, something which leads to a drain of capital from the Western countries into the United States." Meanwhile, in his radio broadcasts, the head of the U.S. Administration attempted to justify his policy completely, calling for a "strong dollar."

The President also touched on the question of trade between the United States and the Soviet Union, alleging that his desire was "to foster progress and peace between our peoples." This statement sounded particularly hypocritcal. After all, the present administration has embarked on a path of curtailing trade and economic exchange between the USSR and the United States, attempting to make trade an instrument of its anti-Soviet policies, something which has dealt a blow, above all, to the interests of the American business world and working people.

## U.S. SEEN DISRUPTING MILITARY EQUILIBRIUM

PM051500 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Russian 5 Aug 83 First Edition p 3

[Article by Candidate of Military Sciences L. Semeyko: "In Pursuit of Superiority: The Dangerous Nature of the Development of U.S. Military Doctrine"]

[Text] The aggressive aspects of U.S. military docrrine have recently been stepped up even further. Significantly greater emphasis has been placed on the globalism of its principles, on their offensive character, on the readiness for so-called preemptive use of nuclear might, and the desire to achieve military superiority. The accelerated growth of military and strategic concepts aimed at disabling the USSR by a surprise strike in an illusory calculation that victory can be gained.

The foundations for these changes were laid by the two preceding U.S. Administrations and formulated in President Carter's famour directive No 59. The Reagan administration has not only undertaken its active implementation but has also stepped up the aggressively offensive nature of U.S. military doctrine as a whole. This mainly applies to the question of the possibility of launching a nuclear war.

It is well known that all U.S. Presidents have refused to give the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. In fact, today the readiness to use these weapons has been essentially promoted to the status of main principle of U.S. military doctrine. This is in fundamental contradiction with the very idea of strategic stability which the U.S. leadership advocates in words. Furthermore, the course that has been taken leads to the accelerated growth of an offensive nuclear potential, which is supposed to ensure the possibility of delivering a disabling strike. It is quite clear that such a potential can in no way be meant to "deter the Russians," as people in Washington love to proclaim.

Of course, these people cannot but realize the disastrous consequences of launching a universal nuclear war and the fact that to disable the Soviet Union is a practically unattainable goal. Hence the greater stress on "limited" nuclear war, in other words, a war which would be limited only to the European Continent or, at worst, only to a small number of military targets in the United States itself. Even within the framework of the projected "limited" war, however, plans are being made to attempt, by being the first to use nuclear weapons, to reduce as far as possible the USSR's defense potential -- and its nuclear missile defense first and foremost -- and present the Soviet Union with the dilemma of either agreeing to expand the scope of nuclear war with its unpredictably destructive consequences or "capitulating." In the Pentagon vocabulary this is known as ending the war "under conditions advantageous for the United States."

An even more sinister option is being contemplated for the more distant future: to disable the USSR through the joint effect of strategic offensive and defensive facilities. This is the purpose of the space-based ABM defense system which is now being developed and which, or so people in the Pentagon calculate, would supposedly be capable of intercepting and destroying the Soviet retaliatory strike facilities which survive a first U.S. strike. The practical implementation of this option could, or so they claim, not only result in the destruction of the USSR Armed Forces, its key industrial targets, and its centers of state and military command, but also protect the United States against the consequences of a nuclear catastrophe. The calculation on victory, no matter how reckless it may be, emerges here at its boldest.

The military and stragetic equilibrium existing between the USSR and the United States clearly does not suit the U.S. leadership. In its opinion it is possible to secure victory in any nuclear war only under conditions of U.S. nuclear superiority. The principle of superiority was formulated even in the election platform of the incumbent Republican Party. Now they are attempting the practical implementation of this principle. The program of developing a new generation of high-precision strategic missiles and bomber aircraft with long-range cruise missiles by the end of this decade is considered a major step toward gaining strategic superiority. For the sake of political camouflage it is now being described as "security reserve." A sharp increase in the funds for strategic forces is planned so as to build up this "reserve." While in 1975-1981 these funds increased 76 percent, their growth in 1981-1985 will reach 260 percent. Estimates are now being made in trillions.

More, in effect, is now being staked on the concept of "escalatory dominance" [eskalatsionnoye dominirovaniye], according to which the United States must have superior forces at all levels of a nuclear conflict, both in the projected "limited" war and in an unlimited nuclear war.

And this is why, in parallel with the growing strategic forces, it is planned to establish a powerful "Eurostrategic" potential by deploying in West Europe 572 U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles capable of high-precision strikes against targets on USSR territory. The tactical nuclear potential is being modernized and the development of neutron ammunition is being accelerated for the very same purpose. Strategic planning, according to Pentagon boss Weinberger, must ensure a broad range of alternatives: from the use of a small number of nuclear weapons to the utilization of "a significant part of the strategic nuclear forces against a wide range of targets." But under any option, people in the Pentagon believe, U.S. might must be superior to Soviet might -- and this is the principle of the planning to ensure "advantageous conditions" for ending the war.

The thesis about a protracted war, nuclear or conventional, is also being propagandized in the United States. For the purpose of waging it, it is planned to enhance the "invulnerability" of strategic forces, the reliability of the strategic command system at all its levels, and the survivability and productivity of the military-industrial base, and also to step up the civil defense system. The hypocritical statements about the desire to significantly reduce nuclear might do not in any way accord with this practice. Reagan proposes to the Soviet Union to implement such a reduction as would give the United States an obvious superiority in nuclear might, which would be completely in accord with the U.S. military doctrine's gamble on superiority at all levels of nuclear confrontation.

Vain hopes! The Soviet Union will not engage in unilateral nuclear disarmament, nor will it allow the existing military and strategic equilibrium to be disturbed. Our country -- and this was emphasized at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum -- will continue to enhance the combat might of its armed forces, which are a powerful factor for containing imperialist reaction's aggressive aspirations.

New elements which generate alarm in the world can also be seen in the U.S. strategists' views on the waging of conventional warfare. In the first place, they are calculating on its global and more active conduct. The Reagan administration has rejected the concept of "two and a half wars" and its successor of "one and a half wars." "Strategic concepts based on far-fetched limitations on the possibility of escalation are not realistic," Weinberger declares. Washington no longer intends to limit the conduct of conventional warfare to any set number of regions, since the notorious U.S. "vital interests" are now essentially spread all over the world. The United States must be prepared, the Pentagon's leader declares, not only for a "vertical" escalation (transition from the use of conventional weapons to the use of nuclear ones) but also for a "horizontal" escalation (transfer of combat operations from one region to another). For this purpose the Rapid Deployment Forces are rapidly becoming a frontline potential for armed intervention in other countries. The strategic mobility of conventional armed forces is increasing considerably. The might of the Air Force and the Navy is growing quantitatively and qualitatively. Furthermore, Navy Secretary Lehman incessantly asserts that the U.S. Navy must become the dominant force in the world's oceans.

Secondly, it is planned to establish conventional armed forces that would be capable of directly threatening the Soviet Union's territory. This cannot but be seen as an emphasis on preparing for large-scale offensive operations, something that is obviously confirmed by the adoption of the strategic concept of "airland battle" [phrase in English] (warfare on land and in the air).

Its basic provisions are formulated in the new U.S. Army Field Manual (FM-100-5) which counts on "preemptive launching of offensive operations." The side which is on the offensive, the manual says, must strive "to transfer the battle to the enemy's rear and crush his defense before he is capable of reacting. The enemy must never be given a chance to recover from the shock caused by the first strike.

Thirdly, the incumbent U.S. Administration, possessed by global imperial ambitions, is once more not averse to autocratically engaging in interventionist actions in the world arena. The "Vietnam shock" caused by the U.S. defeat in its aggression in Indochina is being increasingly consigned to oblivion. The role of "world gendarme" is again obsessing those in power in the United States. This is evidenced in particular by the large-scale military adventures against the peoples of Central America, the expansion of the network of U.S. military bases, especially in the world's "hot spots," and the establishment of the interventionist Rapid Deployment Force and the "Central Command" (CENTCOM) whose sphere of activity covers 19 Asian and African states situated thousands of kilometers away from the United States.

At the same time Washington is exerting greater pressure on its allies, striving to expand the action sphere of the aggressive NATO bloc and its membership. The purpose is to involve them in the new militarist adventures contemplated by the Pentagon in different parts of the globe, mainly in the Near and Middle East.

The danger of this plan was pointed out in the joint statement adopted at the 28 June Moscow meeting of leading party and state figures from the fraternal countries. "The states represented at the meeting," this document emphasizes, "reaffirm most forcefully their opposition to any steps leading to the expansion of NATO's sphere of action or to the establishment of any new military-political groupings."

The White House's adventurous militaristic policy is combined with the "psychological warfare" it conducts on a hysterically anti-Soviet and anticommunist note. The myth about the "Soviet threat" is being blown up everywhere to cover up the real military threat stemming from the desire of U.S. ultrareactionary circles for world domination. The extremely risky actions by U.S. imperialism in the international arena, and its military doctrine with its openly aggressive offensive nature, are subordinated to this reckless idea.

"We are aware of, and properly evaluate, the imperialists' policy and their attitude toward the socialist countries, and we will never forget the tragedy for the peoples which resulted from the course of 'pacifying' the aggressor," Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, USSR minister of defense, declared in reply to a TASS correspondent's questions. "Remembering this, we are obliged to take measures and respond to the growing nuclear threat. Ths response must be such that a sense of self-preservation prevails in a potential aggressor over his intention to launch aggression against us."

Let this be remembered by those who, by increasing international tension to its limits, are pushing mankind toward a nuclear catastrophe.

USSR CHEMICAL WEAPONS USE U.S. 'HULLABALOO'

LD052359 Moscow TASS in English 1925 GMT 5 Aug 83

[Text] Moscow August 5 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Askold Biryukov writes:

The U.S. Administration has submitted "new evidence" at the United Nations to buttress up its previous assertions about alleged use of the chemical and toxin weapons in Southeast Asia by the Soviet Union and its allies. This time the authors of a report issued on behalf of the U.S. permanent mission at the United Nations, do not refer, it is true, either to the USSR or to countries allied with it. Possibly because, as THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, the conclusions contained in the report can well be questioned by serious scientists, as has already been the case more than once in the past. The newspaper admits that the report adds to the body of "evidence" produced by the USA but does not essentially change the picture.

Nevertheless, Jack Reynolds, an NBC correspondent, deemed it possible for himself, by using the publication of the report as a plea, once again to make pronouncements on the subject of a "use" of chemical weapons in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan by the Soviet Union. The journalist stated in a tone permitting no doubt that the latest report indicates that the Russians still continue to use chemical weapons. And he added that that has aroused strong indigation on the Capitol Hill.

It is difficult to us to determine the degree of intensity of anti-Soviet sentiments in certain spheres on the Capitol Hill, the sentiments which are systematically heated up by circles which hope for ensuring military superiority for the USA. Let the assertion remain on the correspondent's conscience. But on the strength of the footage which he showed on the screen and the text of a broadcast about hackneyed "yellow rain", one can clearly see who stands behind another slanderous hullabaloo. The correspondent stated during the broadcast that the Pentagon admits that the Soviet Union is ahead of America in the preparation for chemical warfare.

Thus, the picture really does not change. And not only with the emergence of "new evidence" which adds nothing new to the "data", which have already been repeatedly and authoritatively disproved in the past, on a use of chemical weapons by the Russians. Neither does the picture change in the sense that slanderous campaigns on this subject are still ordered by those circles in Washington which need to justify by any means the frenzied arms race being spiraled up by the USA, including that in the field of chemical weapons. It is not fortuitous that the publication of the report is timed for the moment when there is tough battle in Congress over the administration's plans to speed up the chemical arms race and when many congressmen came out against financing U.S. preparation for a large-scale war with the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons. The administration's another falsehood, just as the tale about the Pentagon's "lagging behind" in the development of chemical weapons, are needed to Washington to facilitate the task of putting its adventurist plans through Congress.

## U.S. ADMIRAL CROWE'S MEETING WITH NAKASONE REPORTED

### 'Anti-Soviet Direction'

LD050918 Moscow TASS in English 0759 GMT 5 Aug 83

[Text] Tokyo August 5 TASS -- Admiral William Crowe, the new commander of the U.S. Armed Forces in the Pacific, during his meeting on Thursday with Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone demanded that Japan beef up its military might.

Admiral Crowe used his first meetings with Japanese leaders to stress the anti-Soviet direction of the Japanese-American military-political alliance.

Shortly after arriving in Japan, Crowe demanded greater "cooperation" from Japan in ensuring the earliest deployment of fifty nuclear-capable F-16 fighter-bombers at the American Misawa airbase in northern Japan.

The American admiral said to the head of the Japan Defence Agency, Tanikawa, that the United States expected great results from the recently started Japanese-American consultations on joint actions along international sea lanes one thousand miles off Japanese coasts. These consultations are assessed here as evidence of the United States' aspiration to entrust its Japanese ally with some of its gendarme functions in the western Pacific.

Crowe's meeting with the Japanese leaders is viewed in the Tokyo journalistic community as part of Washington's far-reaching campaign of pressure intended to wrest official consent to the deployment of American nuclear weapons, specifically cruise missiles and nuclear-carrying planes in Japanese territory. Cruise missiles have already been sited in Guam Island. The first meetings of the new American commander in the Pacific attest to the intention of the Washington strategists to sweep Japan deeper into the orbit of their dangerous global plans.

### Demands Deployment

LD061322 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 6 Aug 83

[Text] A report from Tokyo says that Admiral William Crowe, the new commander in chief of U.S. forces in the Pacific, has met Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone. The Pentagon's representative demanded Japan's buildup of its military might. At the microphone is our commentator Boris Andrianov.

[Andrianov] The conduct of the American admiral in the Japanese islands gives one grounds for saying that he did not feel the least bit like a visitor there. One got the impression that William Crowe turned up for a tour of inspection -- to see for himself what progress was being made on equipping militarily the unsinkable aircraft-carrier into which Prime Minister Nakasone has promised to turn Japan.

By all accounts, the American commander in the Pacific was dissatisfied with what he saw. This was shown by the tone of his statements and his soldier's abruptness, characteristic of a haughty commander addressing subordinates.

Crowe had hardly stepped onto Japanese soil when he was demanding that the Tokyo authorities arrange for the earliest deployment at the Misawa Air Force Base of 50 American F-16's which carry nuclear weapons. Meeting Tanikawa, the director general of the Japanese Defense Agency, the American admiral told him that the Pentagon expected more results from the Japanese-American consultations, which had started on the subject of joint actions on international maritime lines of communication within a range of 1,000 miles from the shores of Japan.

Jouranlistic circles in Tokyo believe that far from all the issues that Admiral Crowe discussed with Japanese leaders have been made public. In particular, it is believed that his appearance in Japan is connected with Washington's latest attempt to pressure Tokyo into an official agreement to deploy American nuclear weapons, specially long-range cruise missiles, on Japanese territory. The target of these weapons of mass destruction is evident from the statement of William Crowe himself. The Pentagon emissary considered it unnecessary to talk about this in private, publicly stressing the anti-Soviet thrust of the military and political alliance between the United States and Japan.

It may, or may not be, a coincidence that the American admiral's trip coincided with the 38th anniversary of the barbaric bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Then, the U.S. military turned these two cities into its atomic targets. Now, the Pentagon plans to make the whole of Japan the nuclear hostage of the transatlantic strategists. Today, 6 August, the Japanese people view this with particular indignation -- indignation over the cynical designs of the instigators of a new war.

## USSR PRECONDITIONS FOR KURIL VISITORS SET

OW060230 Tokyo KYODO in English 0208 GMT 6 Aug 83

[Text] Moscow Aug 6 Kyodo -- Japanese pilgrims wishing to visit the graves of their ancestors on Soviet-held northern islands [Kuril Islands] will be admitted, if they go through normal entry procedures for foreigners visiting Soviet territory, the Foreign Ministry said Friday. But such a precondition is totally unacceptable to the Japanese Government as it would be an admission of Soviet ownership of the islands.

The Tokyo government had asked for Soviet approval for a visit by former residents of the so-called northern territories to worship at the graves of their ancestors. In its official response, the Soviet Foreign Ministry agreed to allow such visits as long as the pilgrims fulfilled the normal requirements for any foreigner wishing to enter Soviet territory.

The islands north of Hokkaido were seized by Soviet forces at the end of World War II. Repeated Japanese efforts to obtain their return have been rejected by Moscow.

## U.S. AIMS IN SRI LANKA, SOUTH ASIA ANALYZED

LD072030 Moscow World Service in English 1430 GMT 7 Aug 83

[Andrey Alov commentary]

[Text] According to reports in Colombo, the man in charge of the UPI office in South Asia has been expelled from Sri Lanka for distorting in his reports the developments in that country. The American mass media have claimed that the authorities of Sri Lanka have asked for military aid from the United States and Britain to defend the country against a likely invasion from the outside. Official sources in Sri Lanka have denied the reports. More on this from our observer Andrey Alov.

The above facts provide an additional ground for assessing the events in Sri Lanka and around it. Those in Asian countries who understand the difficulties experienced by the young state are unanimous in speaking with sincere regret about the clashes between the two communities. None of the true friends of Sri Lanka is interested in them [as heard], and the purpose of the latest consultations in Colombo and in the capitals of the neighboring countries was to find effective ways of normalizing a different view of the developments in that country and the provocative calls for accepting military aid from (?fictitious) friends are hard to qualify other than as an attempt to pour oil on the flames. Besides, the provocations are not restricted to words.

Several months ago, another American citizen, the first secretary of the embassy, was asked to leave Sri Lanka. The man was charged with stirring up distrust between that country's largest communities -- the Sinhalese and the Tamils. It would be useful to analyze this keen interest of American secret services in the events in Sri Lanka, together with other moves of the American Administration. It is a known fact that the Pentagon's maps of American naval bases in the Indian Ocean also show facilities on Sri Lanka territory. For example, American admirals consider the port of Trincomalee a potential base for their ships with nuclear weapons aboard. It's been a long time since the Pentagon has set its sights on that port. American companies have concluded contracts for the building in the region of Trincomalee of tanks with fuel for ships. American military vessels have made repeated calls at Colombo, and high-ranking military officials, including the commander of the 7th Fleet, have visited the port on inspection missions.

All that reveals the Pentagon's plans to gain a foothold closer to the shores of South Asia by connecting new strongholds with the base on Diego Garcia. This comparison leads to conclude that there exists a secret scenario for the campaign of pressure with regard to Sri Lanka. That country has been chosen a target of subversion not only due to its strategic position. Sri Lanka takes an active part in the movement of nonalignment. It has initiated the well-known declarations of the UN General Assembly on converting the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. At the proposal of the nonaligned countries, the capital of Sri Lanka has been chosen the site of next year's international conference which is to discuss problems of the Indian Ocean.

At the recent session of the UN special committee on the Indian Ocean, (?in fact) all of its members, with the exception of the United States and its allies, supported the idea. It is obvious that neither the intensive military construction in the Indian Ocean nor the intrigues of diplomats being official Washington desirable results in making the nonaligned countries change their position. Their anti-imperialist stand was reaffirmed by their leaders at the meeting in Delhi last March. Washington has also failed to provoke mistrust between the countries of South Asia.

For example, despite the events in Sri Lanka, the foreign ministers of South Asia's countries, at a recent meeting in Delhi, have decided to stimulate regional cooperation, which they rightfully regard as one of the means of consolidating peace and stability on the subcontinent.

There are other aims the American strategists hope to obtain by using the complication in the situation following the events in Sri Lanka. At what is obviously advice from overseas, some of the papers on Sri Lanka call on the government to sever relations with the socialist countries by charging them, without any grounds, with complicity in the events in the country. It's easy to see what the authors of such fabrications are guided by. The traditional relations of friendship of equal and mutual beneficial cooperation connecting the Soviet Union and the other socialist nations with countries of South Asia have proved to be an important factor of political stability in the region. The same is true of their joint actions in international affairs, which are aimed at preserving and developing the relations of peaceful cooperation, at opposing the schemes of imperialist quarters.

## DRA SPOKESMAN REJECTS PAKISTANI ACCUSATIONS

PM041042 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Aug 83 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Shameless Interference"]

[Text] Kabul, 3 Aug — A spokesman for the DRA Foreign Ministry has totally rejected the Pakistani official circles' accusations concerning alleged violations of Pakistan's air and ground space by the DRA Armed Forces. In a BAKHTAR agency statement he stressed that the DRA Armed Forces have never violated Pakistan's air space or invaded its territory. Accusations of this kind by the Pakistani ruling circles are absolutely false and without any foundation. By means of such fabrications, the DRA Foreign Ministry spokesman noted, the Pakistani Government seeks to conceal its own armed interference in the affairs of democratic Afghanistan.

At the same time, it is known that the Pakistani Government, by arming and preparing the Afghan counterrevolution and illegally sending bandits into Afghanistan's territory for subversive activity against the Afghan people, is shamelessly interfering in our internal affairs. Pakistan's territory is turned into a base for aggression against revolutionary Afghanistan, a base used on a long-term basis by international imperialism, the DRA Foreign Ministry spokesman stated in conclusion.

## SUPREME SOVIET, MALDIVES EXCHANGE CABLES

PM051201 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Aug 83 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Telegrams Exchanged"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has sent a telegram to Maumoon Abdul Gayoom, president of the Republic of Maldives, extending to the president and the friendly Maldivian people congratulations and best wishes on the country's national holiday -- Independence Day. The telegram expresses confidence that the relations of friendship and mutually advantageous cooperation which exist between the two countries will be further developed.

In a reply telegram, on behalf of the government and people of the Republic of Maldives, as well as in a personal capacity, Maumoon Abdul Gayoom expressed deep appreciation and sincere gratitude to the Soviet people for their congratulations and good wishes.

PZPR'S CZYREK DISCUSSES POLAND-USSR BONDS

PM051728 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Aug First Edition p 4

[Article by J. Czyrek, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee "In the Single Formation of the Forces of Socialism and Peace"]

[Text] Warsaw, August -- The time we are living in imposes on the peoples, social forces, political organizations, and governments of all countries an enormous responsibility. I am referring to by far the most important thing -- maintaining peace and averting the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. This is the chief task of the day.

The Joint Statement adopted at their Moscow meeting by the leading party and state figures of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and the CSSR is imbued with a realistic approach, a sense of responsibility, and an unswerving will for constructive actions in defense of peace. Alarmed by the dangerous development of the international situation caused by the imperialist policy of arms buildup and confrontation, our fraternal parties and states reaffirmed with all gravity that they will not depart from the path of persistent struggle for peace and detente, for cessation of the arms race and for disarmament, and for the strengthening of international security. Speaking out against imperialism's desire to wreck the equilibrium prevailing in the world, against the "from a position of strength" policy, they expressed the conviction that "no world problems, including the historic dispute between socialism and capitalism, can be resolved by military means."

The struggle for the principled directions of the international situaton's development is today under way on a global scale. The source of the dangerous tension in the present situation is the aggressive policy of imperialism, primarily American imperialism, which seeks to stem the revolutionary, progressive historical processes and recover its lost world domination. This aim is served by the course adopted by the U.S. Government and its NATO allies aimed at escalating the arms race and achieving a military-political advantage over the socialist states. Preparations for the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in some West European NATO countries are proceeding at full speed. An awesome shadow hangs over Europe -- the continent which has suffered most in the past from the storms of war.

Millions of people of goodwill are acting against the war preparations and for peace. The voice of protest against the further deepening of tension on our planet is resounding ever more widely and loudly. The World Assembly "For Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War" held recently in Prague, was cogent proof of this.

Communists and the forces of socialism stand in the front rank of the fighters for the earth's peaceful future. This stems from the profound humanist principles of our ideology, from the scientific Marxist-Leninist analysis of the world situation. As Yu.V. Andropov observed at the June (1983) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, "...in our epoch it is socialism that acts as the most consistent defender of healthy principles in international relations, the defender of the interests of detente and peace and the interests of each people and all mankind."

The party of Soviet Communists founded by V.I. Lenin confirms this indisputable truth by its entire history, by its program and activity. Emerging from Lenin's strategy and from the decisions of the supreme party forums -- the congresses of the CPSU -- the consistent, peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union is fully reflected in concrete Soviet initiatives and proposals, in the tireless efforts being undertaken by the USSR jointly with the other states of the socialist community with a view to limiting and reducing armaments and strengthening and developing the positive trends in international relations.

In the Prague Political Declaration the Warsaw Pact states countered the policy of the United States and its NATO allies -- a policy that is exceptionally dangerous for peace -- with the realistic and constructive alternative of a return to dialogue, detente, and cooperation based on the principles of peaceful coexistence between countries with different sociopolitical systems and on the just principles of equal security in relations between East and West. The position of the participants in the Moscow meeting provided further convincing confirmation of the socialist states' consistency and determination in persistently striving to strengthen the foundations of peace in Europe and throughout the world.

History has proved that the strength and cohesion of the countries of our community and their collaboration in building socialism and defending peace constitute the main obstacle in the path of imperialist aspirations for world domination and in the path of the policy of intensifying international tension and the arms race. The imperialists know this and are endeavoring by every means to discredit real socialism, undermine the socialist community countries' historic role, and shake our unity. Western propaganda has once again dragged out of its armory the hackneyed "threat from the East" myth. To the accompaniment of the slogans of Reagan's "anticommunist crusade" they have unleashed, disdaining no means whatever, a campaign bearing all the hallmarks of politico-ideological aggression.

Attacks on Poland have been assigned a particular place in this onslaught recently. Taking advantage of the complex situation in our country, the imperialists gambled on the galvanization of antisocialist counterrevolutionary forces in our midst. When, through our own resolute actions taken in December 1981, we thwarted these counterrevolutionary calculations and plans, the West decided to "punish" Poland. An unprecedented campaign, ranging from political pressure and attempts to isolate us in the international arena to direct interference in our internal affairs with the help of subversive means and methods of psychological warfare, was unleashed against our country. It is no coincidence that this atmosphere created around Poland voices openly disputing the immutable nature of Poland's borders have again been heard in right-wing nationalist circles in the FRG, among which are representatives of the government. This confirms yet again that the policy of pursuing the arms race and intensifying international tension pursued by the United States is in keeping with the aspirations of those who would like to reverse the course of history and revise the political and territorial realities that resulted from the rout of Hitlerism and postwar development and that constitute the foundation of European peace and security.

But no frenzied campaign directed against Poland and against socialism can reverse history. Our country is not alone. At precisely this difficult time the new internationalist quality of the relations linking Poland and the USSR and all the fraternal socialist countries -- relations based on mutual respect and equality and on common ideals and objectives -- has been demonstrated once again in all its magnitude. Understanding and trust, fraternal aid and support from our allies and friends, primarily the land of the soviets, are of vital significance for our efforts aimed at overcoming the current difficulties and securing sociopolitical and economic stabilization.

The bonds of friendship and comprehensive cooperation with the Soviet Union have been, are, and will remain fundamental in Polish foreign policy -- the inviolable foundation of socialist Poland's sovereignty and security and a firm component of the unity and cohesion of the countries of our community. These bonds, the traditions of which stem from the common history and joint struggle of Polish and Russian revolutionaries and from the brotherhood in arms and blood shed in the struggle for liberation and victory over Hitlerite Germany, are firm and strong. With the Soviet Union's help and support, our country was reborn within just and secure borders after World War II, rose up out of the ashes of the war, and has implemented historic state-political and socioeconomic transformations.

As a socialist state and a member of the Warsaw Pact and CEMA, Poland has strengthened its international positions and become an active fighter for a policy of peace and security in Europe.

The fruitful visits by Polish party and government delegations to the USSR and other socialist countries, the talks that have taken place, particularly the meetings and talks between W. Jaruzelski and Yu. V. Andropov, are of great significance for developing and strengthening Poland's relations with its socialist allies and friends. The support for Poland in the international arena found convincing expression in the Prague Political Declaration. The fraternal parties supported our resolute position against the attempts by the West to interfere in Poland's internal affairs, stating that "Poland's internal affairs will, as up until now, be decided by Poland alone."

We are still struggling against many difficulties in Poland. We are also aware that a long and difficult struggle and tremendous exertion lie ahead of us. But nothing will deflect us from the chosen road -- the road of struggle to strengthen socialism in Poland. There can be no doubt about this. We have shown that the forces of socialism in our country are capable of countering the threats and effectively defending the interests of working people and the socialist state. Everybody who objectively and comprehensively compares the present situation with the situation 1 and 1/2 years ago must acknowledge that a stabilization process is visible in all fields. A process of ideological and organizational consolidation of the party, strengthening of its ties with the working class and with working people's ideas, and an increase in the PZPR's initiative and leading role in solving sociopolitical and economic tasks is underway in accordance with the line of the Ninth Extraordinary PZPR Congress.

Despite the numerous persisting difficulties intensified by the economic blockade imposed by the United States, conditions have been created for the restoration of a normal production rhythm and balance in the national economy, as is proved by the good results achieved by the important mining sector. In cooperation with the allied parties -- the United Peasant and Democratic Parties -- and the patriotic forces of society, a broad platform of civil activeness for the benefit of the socialist motherland is taking shape, an expression of which is the Patriotic Movement for National Rebirth.

The structure of socialist democracy is developing and growing stronger, as is evidenced, among other things, by the Polish Sejm's increased legislative activity. Great significance in the process of sociopolitical stabilization is attached to the trade unions, which are being reborn on new principles, safeguarding working people's interests from the class, socialist positions of the Polish Constitution and countering the utilization of the trade union movement for anticommunist objectives. The socialist youth organizations are also becoming more active. The recent conference of young PZPR activists in Gdansk gave important impetus to the mobilizaion of the young generation of Poles to toil selflessly for the sake of the socialist fatherland.

Those who hoped that Poland would become a center of disquiet in Europe, a "Trojan horse" with whose aid it was planned to force a breach in the community of socialist countries, have been cruelly disappointed. Our party, "W. Jaruzelski said in his speech at the 12th PZPR Central Committee Plenum, "combines a sense of its responsibility for the implementation of the interests of the working class and the Polish people and for the sovereign and secure existence of the socialist state with a sense of responsibility for the cause of socialism and peace." As in the past, the strengthening of socialism in Poland and the establishment of closer allied bonds between our country and the Soviet Union and also the other socialist countries are inseparably linked with Poland's active participation in asserting peaceful relations and with the struggle for peace and the consolidation of security and cooperation in Europe.

The Polish People's Republic fully supports the Soviet Union's peace initiatives and efforts in the international arena and supports the position expressed in the Soviet Government statement of 28 May this year. We have considered and continue to consider that the strengthening of the socialist community countries' unity and their close cooperation and coordination of policy are of decisive significance in the struggle for peace and socialism. Together with the fraternal socialist countries we express ourselves in favor of a constructive course in international relations and the peaceful and just solution of conflicts in various parts of the world. We will participate in the peace action program contained in the Prague Political Declaration and the Moscow Joint Statement and will make a contribution worthy of Poland in the international arena -- at the United Nations, at the Vienna talks, at the Madrid meeting -- wherever the struggle for the curbing of the arms race and disarmament and for detente and a peaceful future for Europe and the entire world is in progress.

Onerous sacrifices and deprivations from the first day of World War II to the last were the price Poland paid for the right to live in peace and participate in the great movement for peace and a future without wars. Socialist Poland has been and remains among those who advocate the peoples' liberation, socialism, peace, and progress.

U.S. SAID ALTERING STRATEGY AGAINST POLAND

LD052334 Moscow in Polish to Poland 1300 GMT 5 Aug 83

[Excerpts] In their anti-Polish statements, American politicians and propagandists have changed their tone somewhat. Now one hears abuse addressed at the Polish People's Republic less and less frequently. It has been replaced by ceremonious expatiations in defense of human rights and the process of democratization in Poland. It must be pointed out that the demagogues from Washington are by no means resorting to these topics for the first time, writes Radio Moscow commentator Aleksandr Danilov. They were used for the first time by the former head of the White House, President Carter. Hiding behind this slogan, the United States began to carry out a wide-ranging operation headed by Zbigniew Brzezinski to provoke a crisis in Poland. Reagan's administration for some time stopped (?mentioning) these topics, laying stress on the so-called fight against international terrorism. It is well-known moreover that national liberation movements and patriotic and democratic forces, acting against fascist juntas and reactionary monarchies in support of democracy and social progress, were treated as terrorists.

How, then, did the United States defend human rights in Poland? These methods comprised divisive appeals by the highest American leaders and subversive radio stations addressed to the antisocialist elements which had resorted to conspiracy. The campaign, outrageous to Poland's dignity, waged, in all representative forums, from the meeting in Madrid to the ILO conference, all kinds of sanctions that worsened the situation of the Polish working masses and caused losses to the Polish economy amounting to billions of dollars. In Washington a visible new zeal exists, an enthusiasm for the previously rejected concept of defense of human rights. The Reagan administration has espoused the notion of applying this experience accumulated during the subversive activity against Poland to all the countries of the socialist community, and to the developing countries. Just now the American Congress is discussing the draft document, drawn up in the White House, with the grandiloquent title: Project Democracy. This is a plan, worked out to the smallest detail, of a crusade against communism, a crusade which was announced by Reagan last summer during his speech to the British Parliament.

Adapting to the changing situation and taking into account their lack of success in Poland, where events took a completely different course from that dreamed of by the White House, Washington's theorists are perfecting the strategy of interference in the affairs of sovereign countries.

Because the use of political blackmail and economic pressure against Poland did not yield the expected results, Washington now intends to take a more flexible stance. The aide to the secretary of state for human rights and humanitarian problems, Elliot Abrams, made it known that the United States does not intend to limit itself in the future to negative aspects only; i.e., to making accusations against the socialist countries and other states hostile to the United States about violation of human rights and applying sanctions to them. Particular attention, Abrams explained, will be devoted to the positive side: supporting democracy; in other words, to the ineffective stick to be added the carrot. However, these propaganda tricks are capable of misleading only very politically naive people, just like the honeyed words in defense of democracy and human rights. From recent history we know what is concealed behind this. The Polish counterrevolution, which functioned according to the scenario written by the Western propagators of those slogans, prepared a massacre of communists, a physical annihilation of the supporters of the people's authority. But, regardless of what propaganda smokescreen is used to mask the offensive against the interests of socialism, it is doomed to fiasco. Our community has more than once proved that it is able to defend itself, to administer a firm and constant rebuff to its opponents.

INFORMATION, PROPAGANDA OFFICIALS VISIT POLAND

For reportage on the visits of Leonid Zamyatin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and head of the Department of International Information, and Georgiy Oganov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department, to Poland, see the Poland section of the 8 August Eastern Europe DAILY REPORT.

NURIYEV, BAYBAKOV ATTEND SFRY EXHIBITION

LD072012 Moscow in Serbo-Croatian to Yugoslavia 1600 GMT 7 Aug 83

[Summary] A Yugoslav agricultural industry exhibition held in Moscow has ended. About 300 Yugoslav work organizations participated, and the exhibition was visited by approximately 30,000 Soviet experts. The importance attached in Moscow to the exhibition of Yugoslav organizations is indicated by the fact that the exhibition was visited by Comrade Nuriyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Comrade Baybakov, chiairman of the state planning committee; Comrade Mesyats, USSR minister of agriculture; and other leaders.

ROMANIA'S VLAD MEETS COUNTERPARTS IN MOSCOW

AU040917 Bucharest AGERPRES in English 0859 GMT 4 Aug 83

[Text] Moscow (AGERPRES) 4 August -- Aspects of the intensification of the Romanian-Soviet collaboration in oil and gas industry were approached during the talks Gheorghe Vlad, Romanian minister of oil, had with executives of the Ministries of the Gas and Oil Industry of the USSR.

During his visit to the Soviet Union, the Romanian minister was guest of several relevant institutes.

## BRANDT COUNTERS U.S. ON DEPLOYMENT, ARMS TALKS

LD071450 Moscow TASS in English 1337 GMT 7 Aug 83

[Text] Washington August 7 TASS -- Willi Brandt, chairman of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, and former West German chancellor, criticises the assertions of those Western politicians who maintained that the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles would allegedly "promote" the attainment of an agreement in the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe. In an article contributed to THE WASHINGTON POST, he writes, in part: "I fail to see how negotiations could become easier or less complicated once the stationing of missiles has begun. All our experience suggests the opposite will be true. It is easier to avoid the deployment of missiles than to get them removed once they are installed". Willi Brandt notes in this connection that 65 per cent of West German population opposed the new missiles.

Willi Brandt denounced the "arguments" of U.S. and some Western European officials to the effect that nuclear forces of France and Britain should not be taken into account in evaluating NATO's overall potential in Western Europe. "One cannot overlook the fact that France and Britain also have strategic nuclear weapons with medium ranges", he writes, adding that they would be in a position to strike the other side. "I believe it is understandable for the Soviet Union to want to negotiate about these weapons as well as those of the United States. For in case of a conflict, it certainly isn't likely that those weapons of the French and the British would be used against the West", Willi Brandt underlines.

The former West German chancellor pointed out that the actions of the Soviet side would be perfectly legitimate once the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe has started. However, the continuing arms race does not increase security. On the contrary, it creates more and more dangerous uncertainty.

Willi Brandt sharply criticises the assertions of the Washington administration concerning the possibility of "tactical" nuclear wars. "I presume a nuclear war could not be controlled or limited", Willi Brandt emphasises. According to Mr Brandt, the German peace movement grew strong since the officials in Washington began expressing views about the possibility of fighting and winning a "limited" nuclear war in Europe.

## IZVESTIYA DECRIES NEW 'PATRIOTIC FERVOR' IN FRG

PM051315 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch from correspondent A. Grigoryants under the rubric "Notes Apropos": "Playing at 'Patriotism'"]

[Text] Bonn -- A new political animal called a "patriot" is breeding at an incredible rate on the Rhine. It has seized every rostrum and filled the airwaves and newspaper columns. All those who only recently were fervently offering up prayers for "European integration" and the "Atlantic alliance" are now tearfully going on about "the motherland" and "the nation."

Figures in the ruling Christian Democratic Union and Christian Social Union [CDU/CSU] bloc are preaching the new faith with particular fervor. Their "patriotic" ardor knows no bounds whatever, not even those between states. It is now fashionable to speak "on behalf of all Germans," in whatever country they live. The German question is once again being declared "open," and "national unity" within the framework of Western Christian European culture is being elevated to the rank of the FRG's supreme state task.

It is astonishing, but true, that those who are now talking about "the nation" and "its unity" have previously sacrificed them in the name of their own selfish class designs. The CDU/CSU waived Germany's national unity in the name of "European integration" in order, relying on the West's combined might, to reenact the war it lost and "eject the Russians from Europe" and restore Germany within the borders of the "Reich." The aged CDU/CSU leader, Adenauer, spoke openly of his willingness to sacrifice the country's reunification if, as he put it, "we can join a strong Western camp."

Today's issue of the newspaper FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU writes reproachfully of the newfound "patriots": "In opting for the Western alliance in the early fifties, the Federal Republic renounced German reunification. At the same time, the government and the then ruling parties, which are now back in power, tried for years to kid the people that the two things (that is, NATO membership and reunification -- A. G.) are compatible."

The recrudescence of "patriotic" emotions has coincided with the latest culmination of NATO's dangerous military-political activity. Protestations of love for the fatherland are being made on the Rhine just when launchpads for U.S. Pershing II and cruise missiles are feverishly being built in various parts of the FRG. And now Bonn is openly saying that the FRG "has no intention of reconciling itself to the partition of the fatherland" and that the "status quo" -- that is, the existence of two sovereign German states -- "is not immutable." And if you listen to the speeches of, for example, A. Dregger, chairman of the CDU/CSU faction in the Bundestag, or H. Wildelen (CDU), minister of inner-German relations, it is easy to see that, as in Adenauer's day, their theme is "reunification" in accordance with Bonn's yardsticks -- that is, by swallowing up the sovereign GDR.

The new tone of Bonn's voice was bound to leave its mark on the country's political life. The Social Democratic Party points out the dangerous consequences of "the conservatives' revival of the German question." The recent increase in nationalist and revanchist feeling in the FRG is no coincidence. Mass rallies of resettlement associations have been held. As we can see, the "patriots" on the Rhine are once again opting for NATO rather than the motherland, and are sacrificing national interests in the name of "Atlantic Solidarity." Nor do they set much store by good relations with the GDR and their other Eastern neighbors, for if the Pershings and Tomahawks are deployed, Germans in the FRG and the GDR will have to look at one another through a thick palisade of missiles.

## ITALIAN SOCIALIST PARTY SHOWS RIGHTWARD SHIFT

PM080945 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Aug 83 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch from correspondent N. Paklin under rubric "On a Topical Theme": "Italy: Government Formed"]

[Text] Rome -- The formation of a five-party coalition government under the prime ministership of Bettino Craxi, political secretary of the Italian Socialist Party [PSI], has ended in Italy. He was given the go-ahead by the leaders of the country's five political parties after their approval of the government program submitted by B. Craxi at their conference. Certain PSI figures hastened to declare the impending creation of the first cabinet since the war to be headed by a socialist prime minister a "historic event." What are the facts of the matter?

The right-wing course pursued by the Christian Democratic Party [DC], which has ruled Italy virtually uninterruptedly for 3 and 1/2 decades, has brought the country into an impasse. Italy is suffering a deep political, economic, and, as it is customarily put here, "moral" crisis. The defeat suffered by the DC at the recent parliamentary election was a manifestation of Italians' dissatisfaction with the party's policy. In the circumstances, the DC was no longer able to demand for itself by way of an ultimatum the key post of chairman of the Council of Ministers, as used to be the case.

It was no coincidence that the choice fell on the socialists. And not merely because President of the Republic A. Pertini, who in accordance with his prerogatives instructed B. Craxi to form a new government, belongs to this party. Since the PSI leadership changed 6 years ago there has been a noticeable shift to the right in its political course.

It is claimed here that for some years now the Italian bourgeoisie has been taking the socialists' measure, seeing them as the DC's possible successors at the helm of state. In previous coalition governments the socialists have been entrusted with the most delicate missions, which the Christian Democrats were not anxious to take on. When, for example, the question of the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles on Italian territory arose, Socialist L. Lagorio was appointed minister of defense and proceeded to comply with the "nuclear arms upgrading" decision foisted by the United States on its West European allies.

In the Government program submitted by B. Craxi for the approval of the five parties' leaders he not only reaffirmed Italy's traditional allegiance to the North Atlantic bloc but also particularly stressed that his government will "firmly" implement the 1979 NATO decision on the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in Italy. In so doing he resorted to the anti-Soviet attacks characteristic of Western propaganda. You would think that he was unaware of our country's numerous proposals aimed at ridding Europe of nuclear missile weapons.

Local observers have drawn attention to the fact that the U.S. State Department has rushed out an official statement stressing that Washington intends to cooperate with B. Craxi's new government. This statement was viewed in Rome as a reaffirmation of the trust the White House places in Italy's socialists.

The DC remains a leading force in the new five-party coalition government. It has managed to secure more ministerial posts in the new cabinet then all the other parties put together, including the posts of foreign minister, interior minister, and others. In the words of Italian observers, the DC plans to shift onto Craxi the responsibility for the next government's adoption of a number of extremely unpopular measures in the country's economic sphere.

Italy also has major foreign policy decisions to make. Provided of course, that he wishes to free himself from the DC's grip, will the socialists' leader be able to invest Italian foreign policy with the dynamism about which he has formerly had so much say? Events will demand an answer to these questions in the near future.

All the signs are that next week B. Craxi's cabinet will get a vote of confidence in the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, where the five parties hold a majority. There is however, no reason to think that it will prove any more permanent or stable than previous coalition governments. The Italian Communist Party has said that it will oppose the new government.

MCFARLANE 'MISSION', ISRAELI REDEPLOYMENT VIEWED

LD061749 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1145 GMT 6 Aug 83

[From the "International Review" program presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] There is no end to imperialist interference in the Near East, where the leading role is played by Israel, the strategic ally of the United States. All this week, White House special representative envoy Robert McFarlane has continued his shuttle operations in Near East capitals. In Tel Aviv, he met with Begin and other Israeli leaders and virtually gave them support. McFarlane also went to Lebanon. Quite recently he replaced Philip Habib, who experienced failure in his most recent efforts and was forced to resign. However, this does not alter the basic issue. McFarlane carries out the same tasks as Habib did; he covers Israeli expansionist activities with the U.S. diplomatic umbrella.

As you know, recently a visit was paid to Washington by two Israeli ministers -- Defense Minister Arens and Foreign Minister Shamir. They virtually received Reagan's blessing for the so-called redeployment of Israeli armed forces in Lebanon. In reality, the issue here is of the withdrawal of the Israeli army to the south of Beirut to strategic positions that are more advantageous. Israel is consolidating its hold in the so-called security zone, which extends 45 km into Lebanese territory.

To all intents and purposes, Tel Aviv has decided to annex one-third of Lebanese territory, which may result in the dismemberment of Lebanon and the further escalation of internal conflict. The situation in southern Lebanon is strained to the limits. The local population is stepping up opposition to the Israeli occupiers. Reports are coming in every day of bold partisan operations in Said, Tyre, Nabatiyeh and other towns in the south of Lebanon; Israeli trucks and jeeps are hurtling off the road; the partisans are carrying out operations against Israeli headquarters and bases.

In recent days quarrels have even flared up between Israeli forces and their former allies, the Phalangist barracks in southern Lebanon, which is evidence of its intention to establish personal control in this region.

The Israeli leaders are very concerned at the state of Israeli forces in Lebanon. Even Begin was forced to admit that the Israeli Army in this area is very exhausted and will suffer considerable losses. So Israel has decided to group its forces in advantageous strategic positions.

Washington, as we have already said, has virtually given its blessing to the occupation of southern Lebanon by Israel, and, according to the British paper THE OBSERVER, it has preferred an alliance with Tel Aviv, which is always a winning card on the eve of elections. The support of the Zionist lobby has very great significance for President Reagan in the forthcoming elections. Washington, the London THE OBSERVER stresses, has tacitly agreed that the entire southern part of Lebanon should serve in the foreseeable future as a security zone, occupied by Israel, which eliminates the chances of Lebanon being restored as an independent, completely unified state.

PLO CENTRAL COUNCIL SESSION, STATEMENT CITED

LD070048 Moscow TASS in English 1920 GMT 6 Aug 83

[Text] Tunis August 6 TASS -- The session of the Central Council of the Palestine Liberation Organization has come to a close in the Tunisian capital.

The participants in the session discussed the situation in the Middle East as well as ways to settle the differences that have arisen in the ranks of the Palestinian Resistance Movement (PRM).

In a final statement circulated today the PLO Central Council has called for stronger unity of Arab countries and for cohesion of all PRM detachments to intensify struggle against Israel's aggressive policy and U.S. intrigues in the Middle East, against the capitulatory Camp David policy and Reagan's Middle East plan, and the Lebanese-Israeli agreement imposed on Beirut. The PLO Central Council firmly came out against the U.S. Administration's intentions to ensure U.S. military presence in the region. The statement emphasizes the need for the all-round strengthening of friendly contacts of Arab states with the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community as well as with non-aligned countries.

A meeting of the PLO Executive Committee opened in Tunis later in the day under the chairmanship of Yasir 'Arafat. The Palestinian news agency WAFA reports that the results of the work of the PLO Central Council, organizational matters, the state of affairs in the PRM, and other matters are being discussed at the meeting.

USSR ENVOY TO LEBANON TRIES TO 'MEND' PLO RIFT

NC070505 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 0415 GMT 7 Aug 83

[Text] Reports from the Al-Biqa' indicate that the Soviet Ambassador to Damascus has arrived in Shtawrah via the military road in Al-Masna. He held a series of meetings with Abu Musa (said Musa Muragha) and his aides, with Arafat's representative, Diyab Al-Atrash attending, in a bid to mend the Palestinian rift upon the request of the Soviet leadership. The reports added that the Shtawrah meeting is the fourth of its kind. The Soviet ambassador has so far not achieved any results.

KUWAITI PARLIAMENTARIANS CONTINUE USSR VISIT

PM041605 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation's Visit"]

[Text] Back in Moscow after a tour of the country, a delegation of the Kuwaiti National Assembly headed by its speaker, M.Y. al-'Adasani, met 29 July with the chairmen of the chambers and the chairmen and members of the standing commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers. An exchange of information took place on the structure of the two countries' parliaments and the main spheres of their activity, and certain current international problems were touched on. During the conversation, the confidence was expressed that the Kuwaiti parliamentarians' visit will help to further develop contacts between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Kuwaiti National Assembly and will make an important contribution to strengthening friendship and cooperation between the two countries.

Taking part in the conversation were the chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities, A.P. Shitikov and V.P. Ruben; USSR Supreme Soviet deputies V.S. Alkhimov, T. Baymirov, M.S. Pichuzhkin, and L.N. Tolkunov; USSR Ambassador to Kuwait P.S. Akopov, and other officials, and Kuwaiti Ambassador to the USSR A.N. al-Jerrah.

A breakfast was given in the visitors' honor on behalf of the chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers. The Kuwaiti parliamentarians visited Moscow Gorispolkom. Ispolkom Chairman V.P. Promyslov acquainted the visitors with the city soviet's activity and with the development of the capital's municipal services and the general plan for Moscow's modernization.

U.S. SEEKS TO 'INTERNATIONALIZE' CHAD CONFLICT

PM080919 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Aug 83 First Edition p 5

[Pavel Demchenko "Commentator's Column": "On an Adventurist Course"]

[Text] The situation in Chad is taking on an extremely dangerous character as a result of direct intervention in the affairs of this central African country by the United States, France, and a number of other states. An official spokesman of the U.S. State Department confirmed that a group of military specialists is on its way there following the dispatch of arms, missiles, trucks, and ammunition.

In a word, the familiar picture that in recent years has become Washington's sinister practice, so it seems, is repeating itself. Any region of the globe is arbitrarily designated a zone of "U.S. vital interests." Arms and other aid are urgently sent to an obedient regime, then a "limited number" of military advisers, and, following them, assault groups from Rapid Deployment Force formations. And somewhere off neighboring shores a squadron carrying warplanes, nuclear weapons, and marines appears.

What has already happened in the Persian Gulf region and in Lebanon is happening today in Central America. And now the same thing is repeating itself with Chad and the neighboring African territory: imperialism is trying to exploit for its own ends the fierce intertribal clashes that flared up in the country more than 17 years ago. It has tried to internationalize a purely domestic conflict by supporting the pro-West regime on the pretext that it was a victim of external, allegedly Libyan, "aggression."

A standard scenario, but no less dangerous for being so. For at the same time an air bridge is being set up between the United States and Chad, there is a buildup of forces off the coast of Libya. A major American naval grouping has already appeared there. U.S. Air Force planes are on constant patrol over the Gulf of Sidra.

Washington asserts that these operations are being conducted "in close cooperation with France," with whom, as a State Department spokesman confirmed, "frequent consultations" are being held. French arms are indeed flowing into Chad. France has aided the dispatch of mercenaries and Zairean detachments. Now, to all intents and purposes, the United States would like to draw France into its own conflict with Libya. However, it is no secret that Washington constantly exploits its allies above all to reinforce its own influence in various parts of the world. The events in Chad can also be seen from this standpoint, for the American Administration, in the opinion of London's THE GUARDIAN, "is resolved to play a more active role on the African Continent."

We are thus talking about the usual manifestation of U.S. imperialist ambitions in yet another part of the world. The USSR, as noted in a TASS statement, roundly denounces these actions that threaten peace and international security. There must be an end to the tyranny of the imperialist states.

LIBYA 'CONCERNED' OVER U.S. ACTIONS IN AREA

LD070903 Moscow TASS in English 0612 GMT 7 Aug 83

[Text] Tripoli August 7 TASS -- The Libyan news agency JANA has expressed serious concern over the U.S. Administration's increasing provocative actions.

The news agency's statement circulated here points out that Washington, by openly interfering in the internal affairs of neighbouring Chad and by sending military advisers and large batches of armaments there, is preparing a pretext for an attack on Libya which firmly rejects U.S. diktat in the region. An evidence of that is provided by the build-up of a striking naval group off the Libyan shores, by the sending of the aircraft carrier "Eisenhower" there and by the transfer of AWACS planes to Egypt.

The forthcoming military exercises of the U.S. "Rapid Deployment Force" in direct proximity to Libyan borders, JANA points out, constitute another link in the Reagan administration's plans aimed at preparing aggression against Libya and at overthrowing the progressive regime in this country.

RESULTS OF ZAIRE'S MOBUTU VISIT TO U.S. REVIEWED

LD060307 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 05 Aug 83

[Text] President Mobutu of Zaire has had a meeting with President Reagan in Washington. A background item from our news analyst.

According to reports by Western news agencies, after the half hour meeting with the Zairean president, Reagan declared he was amazed by the bold decision of President Mobutu to send troops to Chad. I may remind you that on his way to Washington, Mobutu paid a so-called private visit to Paris. The Zairean president had a good reason to choose such a route for his overseas tour. For this is arranged [as heard] with the current events in Chad. Both in Washington and Paris, the Zairean leader has received full endorsement for a good reason again.

The leader of the present regime in Chad, Hissein Habre, having found himself in a difficult position following active operations by the Chadian National Liberation Front forces, desperately urged France to send him French troops. Paris has confined itself to deliveries of arms and the despatch of military advisers. Why should France send its soldiers into a bloodbath in Chad when it has a chance to have Zairean troops sent there? And France, having invested so heavily in the forming, training and equipping these troops.

An appearance is made in Zaire that the troops were sent to rescue the Ndjamena regime on Zaire's own initiative. But Zaire is too greatly dependent on Paris and Washington to decide such a matter at its own discretion. The point is that the Zairean Army is kept on money from the United States, France, and lately, Israel. The country's economy would not be able to function without loans from the West, to which Zaire already owes about 6 billion dollars. In one interview President Mobutu of Zaire said that huge funds are required to despatch, equip and maintain an army contingent in another country. Zaire has no such funds. And so it happens that the involvement of Zairean troops in the Chad war is being paid for by the United States and France. Not surprisingly at their meeting in Washington, President Reagan declared it was important that the United States should do its best to help Zaire, whose foreign debt was in excess of 5 billion dollars.

One high ranking American official is reported by the French news agency as saying that the United States was favorably considering the possibility for changing the deadline for the repayment of Zaire's debts. It has been specified by American official too that the American Government in view of the strategic and economic importance of Zaire, is planning to ask congress for endorsement of an increase in the economic and military aid to that country. And the aid is already worth 30 million dollars. There is no need for further comment. For this reason no one was surprised about the reciprocal gesture by President Mobutu when he announced the decision to supplement the 2,000 Zairean commandos already sent to Chad with another 1,500 men. And so, the Zairean president's visits to Paris and Washinton are linked with determing the role his country is to play in carrying out designs for intervention in Africa by Western nations. All this indicates that Zaire is being drawn farther and farther into imperialist machinations that have nothing to do with the interests of its people.

## USSR, ZIMBABWEAN TRADE UNIONS ISSUE STATEMENT

LD032100 Moscow TASS in English 1824 GMT 3 Aug 83

[Text] Moscow August 3 TASS -- The Soviet and Zimbabwean trade unions strongly denounce the racist terrorist regime of South Africa, which is carrying on its policy of merciless oppression of the black majority within the country and suppression of the progressive trade union movement, grossly ignoring the U.N. resolutions on granting independence to Namibia, and carrying out aggressive and subversive activities against the "frontline" states, stresses a joint statement of the Central Council of the Soviet Trade Unions and the Trade Union Congress of Zimbabwe. A delegation of the leadership of the trade union congress have paid an official visit to the USSR on the invitation of the Central Council of the Soviet trade unions.

The unions of the two countries reiterated their constant solidarity with the just struggle of the patriots and democrats of Southern Africa for the eradication of the shameful system of apartheid and colonial oppression.

The Central Council of the Soviet Trade Unions and the Congress of the Trade Unions of Zimbabwe voice grave worry over the constantly expanding massive aid given to the racist regime of South Africa by the reactionary imperialist forces and transnational monopolies contrary to the decisions of the United Nations and the demands of progressive mankind. Both sides spoke highly of the results of the international trade union conference on sanctions and other actions against apartheid in South Africa, which had taken place in Geneva last June.

Both delegations voiced profound solidarity with the just struggle of the Arab peoples, first and foremost the peoples of Palestine, Lebanon and Syria, in protection of their legitimate national rights and interests against the Zionist aggression, perpetrated with the direct complicity of the U.S. Administration.

The sides voiced their fraternal solidarity with the courageous struggle of the working people and patriots of Chile, Uruguay, El Salvador and Nicaragua against imperialist intervention and the suppression of democratic rights and freedoms and in support of their right to self-determination and free progressive development. They wholly supported the decisions of the seventh non-aligned summit in New Delhi.

The trade union centers of the Soviet Union and the Republic of Zimbabwe appealed to the trade union organizations and working people all over the world to step up their vigilance in the face of the growing aggressiveness of the forces of imperialism, neocolonialism, racism and reaction and to escalate struggle for stronger unity of action of the international trade union movement for the vital interests of the working class, for peace and social progress and against the threat of world thermonuclear catastrophe.

## UPPER VOLTA REPORTED CALM FOLLOWING COUP

LD062249 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 6 Aug 83

[Text] Reports from Upper Volta say that the situation in the country is generally calm following a coup. A curfew is in force and the airport is closed to international flights. The head of the overthrown regime, Jean-Baptiste Ouedraogo, has been put under house arrest. Power was assumed by the National Revolutionary Council, headed by Captain Thomas Sankara, who was prime minister. In a radio address to the country he called on the population to form committees of the defense of (?the) revolution at all levels. He accused the former regime of submitting the country's interests to outside neocolonialist forces.

SHULTZ REMARKS BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE SCORED

LD051956 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 5 Aug 83

[Igor Dmitriyev commentary]

[Text] Secretary of State Shultz told the Senate Foreign Relations Commitee on Thursday that U.S. troops in Central America would defend themselves, but withdraw should hostilities erupt. We bring you a comment by our observer, Igor Dmitriyev:

The statement is so incredible that it is worth repeating. Mr Shultz said: "There is no intent to engage anybody actively. In fact, quite to the contrary. If a hostile situation develops for some reason or another, our forces will withdraw. They will defend themselves, but they will withdraw." By "our forces" the U.S. Secretary of state meant some 6,000 troops to be deployed in Honduras for 6 months of military exercises. These troops are backed by several groups of warships, including an aircraft carrier off Nicaragua's shores. Several months ago Navy officials boastfully said that one modern aircraft carrier was enough to destroy the entire infrastructure of Central America, not of Nicaragua or Honduras, but the entire area.

Who is going to believe that American troops, well armed and trained will fight, or as Mr Shultz said, will defend themselves but eventually retreat, withdraw if hostilities break out? That would mean that U.S. troops were defeated by an inferior force. Will that ever be tolerated by administration officials?

Whenever American advisers were sent abroad, the public was told they were not to take part in combat. This is how it all started in Vietnam. In fact there were less American advisers in Vietnam in 1964 than there are troops in Honduras on the border with Nicaragua at present. American advisers were sent to El Salvador not to fight, but there were American casualties in combat zones. American advisers are now being sent to Chad; the public is again told: They are not to fight. U.S. Marines are deployed in Lebanon; not to fight, but there have been casualties there.

By saying that American troops will defend themselves if attacked but withdraw from Honduras, the U.S. secretary of state flashed a signal to the American public and uneasy legislators said the administration is determined to fight in Central America despite the widespread fears of a new Vietnam there. The most convenient way to open hostilities is to be dragged in a confrontation by being provoked. The sending of troops to Honduras is a provocation and the American public is being prepared for such an eventuality. According to Western military experts, the anti-Sandinist forces operating from Honduras have little chance of defeating the Nicaraguan Army. President Reagan said that he did not expect a peaceful settlement in Central America as long as the Sandinsit Government was in power in Nicaragua. To remove this obstacle, the administration should have a war plan. Part of it was revealed by George Shultz when he said that U.S. troops in Honduras will defend themselves. It's a diplomatic way of saying they'll fight.

START OF 'BIG PINE-2' EXERCISES REPORTED

LD070733 Moscow TASS in English 0716 GMT 7 Aug 83

[Text] Washington August 7 TASS -- An official spokesman for the Honduran Armed Forces Command has announced that U.S.-Honduran military exercises code-named "Big Pine-2" began Saturday. This provocative demonstration of raw military power near the borders of sovereign Nicaragua constitutes an undisguised blackmail of that independent Central American nation.

According to THE WASHINGTON POST, new large units of U.S. troops will keep arriving and joining in the exercises next week.

Almost 6,000 U.S. officers and men are scheduled to take part in the exercises. 16,000 more are staying aboard 19 U.S. naval ships near the coast of Nicaragua. They will take part in naval maneuvers during which they are to practice operations connected with the possible establishment of a sea blockade of Nicaragua.

The U.S. Administration does not bother to conceal that the "Big Pine-2" exercises, to last till next February, may eventually develop into an armed intervention in Nicaragua. U.S. presidential envoy Richard Stone admitted some time ago that the maneuvers could be used for offensive purposes.

NICARAGUAN INTELLIGENCE CHIEF HITS U.S. ACTIONS

LD060812 Moscow TASS in English 0724 GMT 6 Aug 83

[Text] Managua August 6 TASS -- TASS correspondent Sergey Gorbunov reports: U.S. officers from the command of the U.S. Southern Military District in the so-called Panamanian Canal Zone are taking immediate part in planning the criminal actions of the Somocista cut-throats against the people of Nicaragua, Julio Ramos, intelligence chief of the Sandinista People's Army has said at a press conference here. The fact that the Pentagon, along with the CIA, has joined in the subversive activities in Central America shows, he said, that the militarist plans of the Reagan administration are particularly dangerous.

In the course of the press conference the journalists were shown photographs and copies of documents taken from counterrevolutionaries' archives which expose the Washington administration's conspiracy with the reactionary army of Honduras and Somocista terrorist groupings. Counterrevolutionaries, Julio Ramos said, are now openly discussing a plan of aggression against Nicaragua with the participation of the Honduran Army and the U.S. warships intended to establish a blockade of the republic from the sea.

The intelligence chief of the Sandinista People's Army also said that during the recent period individual units of the Somocista groupings had infiltrated Nicaraguan territory where they were being pursued by the Sandinista People's Army. About 1,200 counter-revolutionaires based in Honduras are waiting for Washington's order on the beginning of an armed invasion of Nicaragua.

At present the U.S. secret services are trying to regroup the Somocista gangs which have not yet recovered from grave losses they suffered earlier this year. However, panic and fear of the strong blows of the Sandista People's Army are still rife among the counter-revolutionaries, Julio Ramos stressed.

RYABOV RECEIVES NICARAGUAN AGRICULTURE MINISTER

PM061931 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] A conversation was held on 28 July between Ya. P. Ryabov, chairman of the state committee for foreign economic relations, and J. Wheelock, member of the Sandinist National Liberation Front National Directorate and Nicaraguan minister of agriculture. During the conversation questions relating to Soviet-Nicaraguan economic and technical cooperation in the agriculatural sphere were discussed.

'CARIBBEAN INITIATIVE' CALLED 'SMOKESCREEN'

LD070052 Moscow TASS in English 2236 GMT 06 Aug 83

[Text] Washington August 6 TASS -- (From TASS correspondent V. Legantsov)
President Reagan has signed a bill known as the "Caribbean initiative" on promoting the trade of the Caribbean countries. The White House's plan, which combines measures of military, economic and political character, constitutes in point of fact a new refined neocolonialist programme. It is overtly aimed at subordinating the entire region to U.S. imperialist interests, at keeping in power the dictatorial regimes obedient to Washington, and at perpetuating the domination of U.S. monopolies. The "Caribbean initiative" openly proclaims that Caribbean states should follow the capitalist way of "free enterprise," at the same time remaining in the position of agrarian-raw material appendages of the USA.

As is clear from the provisions of the bill, the administration devotes considerable attention to giving military and economic aid to the anti-people Salvadorean regime which with Washington's direct support, is trying to drown in blood the country's movement for national emancipation. Honduras, the territory of which has been converted by the Central Intelligence Agency into a springboard for subversive terrorist operations against independent Nicaragua, has not been forgotten in the "Caribbean initiative" either. Provision is made for substantial financial handouts to Haiti, Guatemala, and other states which obediently follow in the wake of U.S. aggressive policy. Even the U.S. press points out the imperialist nature of the Reagan administrations designs in Central America. The newspaper THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR noted that many observers in the USA view the President's "Caribbean initiative" as a smokescreen which is designed to camouflage Washington's true military and strategic goals in the region.

CHANGING ARGENTINE POLITICAL SCENE EXAMINED

PM071500 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jul 83 Morning Edition p 5

[APN correspondent V. Reznichenko dispatch written specially for IZVESTIYA: "The Clothes of 'The Queen of La Plata'"]

[Excerpts] A signpost in one of the Argentine capital's central squares reads: "Zero Kilometers." All roads are supposed to lead to the Eternal City or spread from it all over the huge country. It is here in Buenos Aires, whose appearance -- according to tourist guides -- combines the characteristics of New York, Paris, and Madris, that Argentina begins.

The country is at a crossroads. The military, who have been in power for over seven years, have pledged to hold general elections at the end of October and, after that, hand over power to a civilian government. It is always far from easy to hand over power, but it is even more complicated to hand over a political inheritance -- the burden of the problems accumulated over long and hard years. The burden of economic crisis which is exhausting the country, the agonizing weight of the Malvinas war, the memory -- lying heavy on the hearts of Argentines -- of the thousand of their compatriots who have "vanished without trace" during the "struggle against terrorism" that is being waged in the country.... The country's two basic parties -- the Peronists and the radicals -- are engaged in fierce polemics. These polemics are aimed at each other and at the present regime. But although both these parties speak confidently of victory at the forthcoming elections, the country's political spectrum is by no means restricted to "two colors" only. As a result of their consistent and persistent struggle, the Argentine Communists have been granted full electoral status on a nationwide scale. The Argentine Communist Party's includence is growing more and more and it is becoming a significant political force which can no longer be ignored.

On the eve of the upcoming changes in the country's life, the United States and its Western allies are striving to do everything possible to retain Argentina in their sphere of influence. On the one hand, Buenos Aires is being tempted with multimillion loans which, it is hoped, will enable the West to continue for many years to come to exercise firm control over the country's policy and economy. On the other hand, they are trying to intimidate the Argentines.

The construction of a gigantic military base equipped with both conventional and nuclear weapons is proceeding at full speed on the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands, which have been usurped by Britain. The base will contain contingents of the "Rapid Deployment Force" type, capable of delivering a powerful strike against Argentina or any other Latin American country if the NATO headquarters consider that the development of political events there "threatens the West's interests."

The Argentines, however, have less and less faith in the good-will of their traditional Western "friends." It has long been known that a friend in need is a friend indeed. Last year's armed conflict in the South Atlantic clearly showed that allies who have sworn their loyalty can, in the twinkling of an eye, shift to the camp of sworn enemies and aggressors.

Argentina is trying to find its place in the ranks of the Nonaligned Movement and in the struggle to establish in the world a just economic order and mutually advantageous cooperation between countries with different social and political systems.

Let us leaf through the latest issues of the local papers. Almost every one of them carries reports on the completion of Soviet-Argentine trade contacts and deals and the prospects for the future development of trade relations.

Turbines supplied by the Soviet Union function successfully at local power stations, giving the country the life-giving energy it needs so much.... Argentine farmers are learning to drive Soviet tractors.... Merchant vessels flying the red banner are frequent visitors at the moorings.... Aeroflot aircraft land once a week at nearby Ezeiza airport, linking the two capitals by direct air communication.

At a recent international book exhibition and fair here, a matreshka twice a man's height -- symbol of the Soviet stand -- was at the center of general attention. You should have seen the interest with which the Argentines looked at and bought teaching and popular science literature published in the USSR! And when, last spring, conductor Yury Simonov appeared at the City's Colon Theater, the 3,000-seat hall, including the normally empty gallery, was filled to capacity.

One more example to show the mutual attraction between two countries situated at opposite ends of the globe: I was told at the Argentine Society for Cultural Ties with the USSR that the number of people wanting to attend the Russian language courses organized here is constantly growing and has reached record levels this year.

Although the locals say that now is the height of winter, the trees are green just like before and temperatures rarely fall below zero. But spring is, nevertheless, always welcome, and this year the "Portenos" [citizens of Buenos Aires] are counting the weeks and months until its coming with particular impatience. This is because spring promises not only a change in the weather but also the long-awaited changes in the country's political climate.

## PROCEEDINGS OF CPSU POLITBURO MEETING REPORTED

LD051702 Moscow TASS in English 1652 GMT 5 Aug 83

["At the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow August 5 TASS -- The Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee at its regular meeting has examined and approved the results of the conversation between Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Le Duan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam. It was noted with satisfaction that all-round fraternal relations between the CPSU and the Communist Party of Vietnam, between the USSR and Vietnam have been successfully developing on the basis of the treaty of friendship and cooperation concluded between the two countries.

The politburo examined the question of holding election meetings at local, district, city, zonal, regional and territorial party organisations, and adopted a detailed resolution on this issue.

In accordance with the CPSU rules, which provide for periodic accounting of party bodies, it is planned to hold election meetings and conferences late in 1983-early in 1984. The successful holding of this major political campaign is to ensure further consolidation of party ranks, development of democracy within the party, perfection of the organising, ideological and political-educational work, forms and methods of party leadership over social and economic processes in the country, growth of the CPSU's leading role in the life of the Soviet society.

Election party meetings and conferences should concentrate their attention on the activity of party organisations and their leading bodies in implementing the decisions of the 26th party congress, May, November (1982) and June (1983) plenary meetings of the CPSU Central Committee.

The resolution of the CPSU Central Committee's Politburo stresses that during the course of the election campaign it is necessary to give an in-depth and self-critical analysis of the results of the work done in industry, capital construction, agriculture and other branches, in each work collective, district, city, autonomous area, region, territory, autonomous republic, to set precise tasks for the future, impart a stable character to the trends towards improvement of basic economic indicators which have become apparent in the national economy. Special attention should be paid to drafting concrete measures to ensure strict fulfilment of the five-year plan of the country's economic and social development.

The Central Committee's Politburo also examined the question of further development of the industry producing protein and other feed additives for needs of animal husbandry.

A resolution adopted by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers provides for a big package of measures for a period through 1990 on developing the production of microbiological and other products necessary for the production of high-quality feed. Solution of all questions stipulated in the resolution will make it possible to improve substantially the supplies of nutritious feed, balanced in the content of protein and other components, for animal husbandry, to meet assignments of the USSR's Food Programme on increasing the output of animal produce. The central committees of the communist parties and the councils of ministers of the union republics, ministries, departments, party, local government bodies and agro-industrial amalgamations are entrusted with the task of implementing measures envisaging greater production of leguminous crops, fuller use of reserves for increasing the output of protein and other feed additives in the microbiological, food, fishery, meat and dairy, mixed-feed, chemical and other industries.

It is also planned to carry out an extensive programme of scientific and experimental work in the field of biotechnology, in developing the raw materials base for producing feed protein and introducing the results of this work into industrial and agricultural production. The Politburo examined the proposals worked out by the USSR Council of Ministers on increasing the efficiency of the use of motor-vehicles in the national economy, stepping up the drive against disruptions of the fixed rules of cargo transportation, and ensuring the saving of fuel and lubricants. Concrete measures were outlined for improving the planning of cargo transportation and other questions of the performance of public motor transport, as well as motor transport of ministries and departments.

The Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee heard a report of the Soviet party and state delegation headed by Mikhail Solomentsev, alternate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, which had taken part in the celebrations of the 30th anniversary of the Moncada barracks storming in Cuba, approved its activity and expressed invariable solidarity of the CPSU and the Soviet state with the efforts by communists, all working people of the Republic of Cuba in building socialism. The Central Committee's Politburo approved the conversations held by the Soviet leaders with Rajiv Gandhi, general secretary of the Indian National Congress (I) Party, who had visited the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR's parliamentary group. It was noted with satisfaction during the conversations that Soviet-Indian relations are developing steadily, in the spirit of the principles sealed by the treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation between the two countries. The Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee examined also at its meeting a number of other questions of international and domestic life of the USSR.

## STATE, PARTY RESOLUTIONS ON LABOR DISCIPLINE

LD061432 Moscow TASS in English 1344 GMT 6 Aug 83

[Text] Moscow August 6 TASS -- The question of intensifying work on strengthening socialist work discipline has been examined at the CPSU Central Committee, the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the All-Union Central Trade Union Council. Corresponding resolutions have been adopted. The resolution of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Trade Union Council "On Intensifying Work on Strengthening Socialist Work Discipline" points out that all-round consolidation of socialist work discipline is a major condition for implementing successfully plans of economic and social development, raising the efficiency of the national economy, strengthening further the foundations of the socialist way of life, enhancing the labour and political activity of the masses, perfecting democracy.

Under the present-day conditions, the resolutions says, there grows the role of work collectives, working people themselves in strengthening labour discipline. The newly adopted law of the USSR on work collectives opens new possibilities for active influence on the performance of each worker, for encouraging front-rank workers and combatting breaches of discipline.

This is more important for there are still big losses of working time in industry, construction, agriculture, transport and non-productive spheres, labour resources are not rationally used everywhere, fluctuation in the supply of trained personnel is reduced slowly. The document points out that the strength of public opinion, Soviet laws and disciplinary measures are not used in full against phenomena of this kind.

Concern for the benefit of the working man has been and remains the supreme objective and main essence of the entire activity of the CPSU and the state, the resolution says. Conscientious work, strict order and organization form the basis for fulfilling the party's tasks on raising the living standards of the Soviet people. The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Trade Union Council in the resolution adopted charge party and local government bodies with the task of carrying out work on all-round consolidation of work discipline, raising the level of organisation and order at enterprises and institutions in order to ensure a higher growth of labour productivity.

Educating all working people in the spirit of profound understanding of their civic duty -- to work conscientiously for the benefit of their motherland -- should be laid at the foundation of this work, the document says.

The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Trade Union Council regard the growth of the role of work collectives and effective use of their rights as the major direction in the work on education and on strengthening socialist labour discipline. It is in the work collective that the personality of the worker in socialist society is moulded and steeled.

Taking into account proposals on the working people, with a view to further strengthening work discipline and reducing the fluctuation of personnal, the USSR Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Trade Union Council adopted a resolution "On Additional Measures for Strengthening Work Discipline".

The USSR State Planning Committee, the State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, ministries and departments of the USSR, councils of ministers of the union republics are entrusted with the task of iproving the balancing of plans, material and technical supply, ensuring the creation of other economic and organizational conditions for non-stop and highly productive performance of work collectives, for enhancing their initiative and responsibility for the fulfilment of plan assignments and commitments.

State and public organisations are recommended to give a critical assessment of the state of labor and production discipline, and adopt concrete measures on its consolidation.

The USSR Council of Ministers and the All-Union Central Trade Union Council worked out tougher measures against absentees and other persistent offenders of labour discipline. The document also spells out measures of rewarding workers and employees doing conscientous work, stressed the need for permanent improvement of cultural and consumer services, labour protection and observance of safety rules, and reduction in all ways of manual, low-skilled and hard physical work.

Resolutions Detailed

LD061730 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 6 Aug 83

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU have examined the question of intensifying work to strengthen socialist labor discipline. Corresponding resolutions have been adopted. The resolution concerning the intensification of work to strengthen socialist labor discipline notes that this is a very important condition for successfully fulfilling economic and social development plans, for raising the efficiency of the national economy and for enhancing the labor and political activeness of the masses. The USSR law on labor collective, which has been adopted, offers new possibilities for actively influencing the performance of every worker and for encouraging frontranking workers in the struggle against discipline violations.

This is all the more important as losses of working time are still great. Some laborers collective farmers and office workers work at less than full capacity, do not hold dear the interests of the collective, are guilty of unauthorized absences, lateness and drunkenness, and often switch from one enterprise to another without justification. Loafers, slackers and drifters often feel themselves to be quite free, being treated the same way as conscientious workers as far as pay and other benefits are concerned.

In the fight against such phenomena, poor use is being made of the power of public opinion, of Soivet laws and disciplinary measures. The part played by workers' meetings and comrades courts in this matter is still insufficient. Certain economic officials, as well as party and trade union organizations, have resigned themselves to tolerate a low level of labor discipline. They conceal facts of poor management and do not take all the measures that they can to restore orderliness in factories. All this is evidence of the large, untapped potential in the national economy, and applying this potential to serve society is a very important economic and sociopolitical task.

The resolution suggests that all party, administrative and economic bodies should work consistently to strengthen labor discipline in every possible way and to improve the level of organization and orderliness at enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhozes, organizations and establishments in order to ensure an accelerated growth in labor productivity. This work should be based on educating all working people in the spirit of profound understanding of their civic duty and to work intelligently and conscientiously for the good of the homeland.

While making broad use of material and moral incentives for selfless labor, it is necessary at the same time to resolutely eradicate the conciliatory attitude toward those who infringe labor and production discipline. To this end, it is therefore necessary to make more effective use of measures involving influence brought to bear by public opinion and existing legal norms. Infringements of labor discipline must be viewed as deviations from fulfilling one's duty to work conscientiously, which is set in the USSR Constitution. The resolution suggests that the responsibility of the chiefs of enterprises, organizations, establishments and their subdivisions for the state of labor discipline and staff turnover be increased. The resolution also says that these same chiefs should be deprived of their bonuses for basic production results and the results of socialist competition and have disciplinary or other proceedings provided for by law brought against them for not taking measures to strengthen orderliness and discipline, to reduce staff turnover or to organize a reliable register of working time losses. The inability of a chief to ensure proper labor discipline must be viewed as not being in accordance with the post that he holds.

The resolution notes the impermissibility of absenting office and manual workers without justification during working hours to hold all sorts of meetings, gatherings and seminars, sports competitions, and amateur talent activities and to organize tourist trips.

Taking into account proposals by working people, and with a view to further strengthen labor discipline and reduce staff turnover, the USSR Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU passed a resolution on additional measures to strengthen labor discipline. This resolution notes that under current conditions the part played by ministers, departmental chiefs and other organs of management and their responsibility for the smooth running and efficient operation of their apparatuses, for businesslike work and strict fulfillment by all workers of the duties placed upon them, and for the state of plan, labor and production discipline is growing considerably.

There must be a more active introduction of advanced forms of organizing and providing incentives for labor, of financial autonomy for work teams and payment according to final results, and of using the coefficient of labor participation. The principle of equal pay for equal work must be strictly followed. There must be no unjustifiable increase in material incentives in order to entice workers from other enterprises.

There must be increased control over the granting of short, unpaid holidays to office and manual workers. Providing cultural and consumer services to the working people, as well as labor protection and safety measures must be constantly improved. Manual, unskilled and heavy physical labor must be reduced in every possible way. The practice of organizing consumer services to working people directly at their places of work must be made more widespread. Particular attention must be paid to further developing a network of children's preschool establishments and improving the organization of public catering. Trade union organization heads must more widely apply the practice of establishing additional privileges and advantages out of incentive funds for production frontrankers and innovators and also for persons who have been working conscientiously for long periods at enterprises and organizations. The task is set of enhancing the role played by local labor bodies and employment centers is making rational use of labor resources, finding jobs for citizens in the shortest possible time, strengthening labor discipline and reducing staff turnover.

In order to step up the struggle against slackers and other persistent violators of labour discipline, the USSR Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU deemed it necessary to lay down the regulation that manual and office workers who have been absent without valid reason will have their routine leave for the year in question reduced by the number of days corresponding to the absence. The same disciplinary measures will apply to manual and office workers absent from work for more than 3 hours a day without valid reason. Manual and office workers guilty of violations of labor discipline, absent without valid reason or attending work in an intoxicated state may be transferred to different, lower paying work for a period of up to 3 months or be switched to a lower grade post for the same period. Resignation from the job must not occur during this period.

It is deemed advisable to raise the material responsibility of manual and office workers for damage caused through their fault while they are performing their labor duties. This includes the turning out of substandard products. Compensation for such damage must not exceed one-third of the worker's annual monthly pay.

The resolution stresses that attendance at work in an intoxicated state or the consumption of alcohol at the workplace are to be regarded as a very gross violation of labor discipline. In order to combat these phenomena, the disciplinary and material responsibilities of manual and office workers have been raised. Specifically, the material responsibility of manual and office workers is laid down to be the full volume of damage caused to the enterprise, organization or establishment through their fault.

We have thus acquainted our listeners with the resolutions concerning the intensification of work to strengthen socialist labor discipline and additional measures for strengthening labor discipline. Both resolutions will be published in the press tomorrow.

IDEOLOGICAL WORK IN COMING ACADEMIC YEAR

PM030841 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Aug 83 First Edition pp 2-3

[Editorial Article: "For Profound Mastery of Marxism-Leninism. In Connection with the Start of the Academic Year in the System of Party Education and Mass Political and Economic Studies"]

[Text] The formation of a Marxist-Leninist world outlook has been and remains a solid foundation for the communist education of the Soviet people. It makes communists and working people conscientious political fighters capable of independently evaluating social phenomena, perceiving the links between current tasks and our end goals, and conducting well argued polemics with any ideological opponent.

It was emphasized in the speech by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum that, despite the entire importance of other questions with which party committees have to deal, ideological work is coming more and more to the fore. The solution of the strategic task concerning the systematic and comprehensive improvement of developed socialism is directly dependent upon the working people's consciousness and activity.

Yu.V. Andropov's speech, K.U. Chernenko's report, and the other plenum materials provide a specific program for the further improvement of ideological activity and the enhancement of its efficiency. One of the party's important tasks in this sphere is to change the style of work in party enlightment and mass political studies.

During the implementation of the 26th Congress' recommendations and the CPSU Central Committee resolutions, the party committees and propaganda cadres have done a definite amount of work to improve the organization of Marxist-Leninist education. The system of party studies at present encompasses over 16 million communists and nonparty activists. The updating of the content and the consolidation of links between studies and life have been helped by the detailed study of the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) Plenum decisions, Yu.V. Andropov's report "60 Years of the USSR," and his article "Karl Marx's Teaching and Some Questions of Socialist Building in the USSR." The students at schools and seminars have stepped up their participation in the solution of practical tasks facing their party organizations and labor collectives.

At the same time, essential shortcomings in the organization of party studies have not been overcome. Many lectures still do not correspond fully with the increased requirements, are conducted formally, and fail to generate keen interest among Communists. Some propaganda workers put up with the public passivity of some of their students. Political self-education and individually tailored studies are developing poorly. The party organizations do not always investigate thoroughly the questions of study content and quality.

The CPSU Central Committee June Plenum analyzed in great detail the state of affairs in this important sector of ideological work, brought to light the existing shortcomings, and determined the ways to further improve the quality and efficiency of party studies. It was pointed out at the plenum that, above all else, it is necessary to put an end to formalism and to the mechanical and detached memorizing of some general principles or others. "The meaning of political study," Yu.V. Andropov noted, "is that each person understands more profoundly the party's policy under today's conditions, is capable of applying in practice the acquired knowledge, and is more clearly aware of, and fulfills in deeds, his own duty."

The party education and mass political and economic studies of the working people must be organically linked with the entire activity of party organizations and labor collectives for the implementation of the course elaborated by the 26th Party Congress and the CPSU Central Committee May and November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums. The fulfillment of the 11th 5-Year Plan and the rates of our advancement depend largely upon the extent to which the studies will help Communists and all working people to mobilize the people's spiritual energy and uplift their labor and social activity.

Our party has given and continues to give unflagging attention to educating communists in the need for theory, in cultivating their interest in and taste for it. This is the CPSU's immutable Leninist tradition.

Drawing guidance from the June plenum decisions and the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the Further Improvement of Party Studies in Light of the 26th CPSU Congress decisions," it is necessary to consistently and persistently improve work in the sphere of Marxist-Leninist enlightment, raise its ideological, theoretical, organizational, and methodological standards, and strive to ensure that party studies can actively help enhance the militancy of party organizations as the leading force and political nucleus of labor collectives.

At present it is the foremost task of party organizations and propaganda workers to ensure the elucidation and detailed study of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum documents, which are of exceptional significance for the entire activity of the party and people. Each communist and all working people must understand well the essence of the plenum decisions and clearly define their own position in the implementation of these decisions. Taking into account the enormous interest of the broad masses in the questions raised by the plenum, it was recommended that two study sessions with working people be organized in July-September at all study course levels on the following subjects: "The Formation of the New Man -- the Goal and Status of Communist Building" and "The Ideological Backup of Socioeconomic Tasks."

The study of the June plenum materials will continue during the current academic year within the system of party education, and the year will start with studies on the subject "Ideological work -- a matter for the entire party, for each Communist." The purpose of these studies is to make the Communists more clearly aware of ways to improve the party's ideological work and of their personal responsibility for improving its quality and efficiency.

The strength of ideological education work stems from its scientific substantiation and its reliance upon the most advanced and constantly developing Marxist-Leninist theory. Our party conducts enormous work on the creative development of revolutionary teaching. Important theoretical generalizations and conclusions have been drawn over the last few years about the nature of the economic, sociopolitical, and spiritual development of Soviet society. They arm the party and all the people with scientifically substantiated methods of analysis of topical contemporary problems.

A major contribution to the theory and practice of scientific communism was made by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov's speech at the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum, in which he gave a profound description of the basic trends in Soviet society's development in the next few years and in the long term, set the main tasks of ideological work, and outlined the key questions pertaining to the elaboration of a new edition of the CPSU Program. The programmatic stipulations and conclusions contained in the speech will be included in all study courses in the system of party education, Komsomol political enlightenment, and mass political and economic studies by working people.

During the new academic year in the system of party education the attention of communists and nonparty activists will be focused on studying the components of Marxism-Leninism and the fundamental theoretical and political problems raised by the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum. The main issue is the profound explanation of the questions of the theory and practice of developed socialism. The laws and nature of the development of its productive forces, production relations, and sphere of distribution must be elucidated at all levels of party study. Party propaganda workers are called upon to vividly and intelligibly demonstrate the dependence of improved living conditions for the people on the results of the conscientious creative labor of each individual and to reveal the nature of the fundamentally new quality of life for the working masses under the conditions of socialism, of everything that is properly termed socialist civilization.

The mastery of the teaching of developed socialism is a scientific and theoretical base for practical participation by communists in the improvement of all its spheres.

The formation of a Marxist-Leninist world outlook must be closely linked with convincing and skillful propaganda of our historic achievements and the new system's advantages. The propaganda of the documents and materials devoted to the 80th anniversary of our Leninist party's second congress is highly important here. Bearing this in mind, it is necessary to give greater attention to study of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the party and the experience of the party's activity at various stages of the struggle for socialism, as well as to demonstrate more fully the growth of the CPSU's leading role in conditions of the improvement of developed socialism.

The sharp exacerbation of the international situation and the confrontation -- unprecedented in intensity and acuteness in the entire postwar period -- between the two diametrically opposed world outlooks and political courses of socialism and imperialism demand that greater attention be given to studying problems of the ideological struggle in the world arena and questions of the CPSU's international activity. A struggle is being waged in the world for the hearts and minds of billions of people, and the fate of mankind depends to a considerable extent on the outcome of this struggle. Hence it is understandable how exceptionally important it is to be able to get across to people, in a intelligible manner, the truth about socialist society, its advantages, and its peace-loving policy. It is no less important to skillfully expose the deceitful subversive propaganda and antipopular policy of imperialism and to educate students in implacability toward bourgeois ideology and morals, high political vigilance, and a class approach to analysis of topical contemporary problems. It is necessary to strive to ensure that, during the study of any topic or problem, effective criticism is leveled at the scientific inconsistency and reactionary nature of bourgeois and revisionist ideology, and that the falsifications of the CPSU's history and policy and the achievements of real socialism are unmasked.

In accordance with the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum instructions, the entire study process will be organized, as before, on the basis of the ideological heritage of T. Marx, F. Engels, and V.I. Lenin and the CPSU documents, in organic unity with the topical problems of the party's domestic and foreign policy and the solution of national economic and sociopolitical tasks.

The schools of Young Communists will continue the study of party organization on the basis of the CPSU Rules, the party program documents, and, mainly, Yu. V. Andropov's speech at the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum. Each person joining the party must be helped to master its ideological and political heritage, its Leninist traditions, and the Bolshevik ethic. The political training of new recruits to the party ranks must be closely linked with the life of party organizations.

The attention of students attending courses on the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism will be concentrated on studying the components of Marxist-Leninist theory, the history of the CPSU, and its economic policy. Those attending political schools are recommended to study topical questions of the party's domestic and foreign policy.

The basic element of study at the schools for scientific communism are special courses on the questions of the theory and practice of developed socialism, on the party's economic and social policy, the CPSU's historical experience, the improvement of the economic machinery, the CPSU's agrarian policy at the present state, the socialist way of life, the ideological struggle in the world arena, and the development of the world socialist system and the international communist movement.

The party attaches particular significance to the Marxist-Leninist tempering of leading party and economic cadres. The successful implementation of party policy requires them to have a profound mastery of Marxist-Leninist theory. In the coming academic year a special 2-year course is recommended for them -- "Topical problems of improving developed socialism." It is important to seek a steady upsurge in the quality of work by the schools of the party and economic aktiv and to step up monitoring of the enhancement of the ideological and theoretical standard of Communist leaders. The ideological aktiv will study questions of the theory and practice of ideological work in light of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum decisions.

Party organizations must step up their attentiveness toward the further development of political self-education and study on the basis of individual plans. Communists with higher education who last year completed the study of subjects chosen earlier are recommended, for independent work, to study first and foremost certain works of the Marxist-Leninist classics, topical problems of the development of socialist democracy and national relations in the USSR, and other questions. To help students doing independent work, it is important to make use of special lectures on key theoretical questions, consultations, seminars, and theoretical conferences. With a view to strengthening the monitoring of communists' independent study and discovering the depth and strength of their knowledge, it is recommended that individual and group discussions be held in party committees on the substance of the questions being studied, bringing in consultants from the ranks of social science teachers and experienced propagandists. It is expedient to alternate organized forms of teaching communists with political self-education under individual plans.

The scientific intelligentsia will continue the study in methodological seminars of philosophical problems in the social, natural, and technological sciences. It is important to enrich the content of the study of topical questions of contemporary social development and the improvement of developed socialism. Methodological seminars must contribute to the process of combing the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of the socialist system.

Study programs for all courses recommended for the party education system are being revised and enriched by the materials of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum.

In the new academic year mass political study will take place in schools of scientific communism set up for teachers, cultural workers, workers in vocational and technical education and the mass information and propaganda media, teacher cadres at educational institutions, and workers in a number of other sectors. Their programs will be revised by the methodological councils of the relevant ministries and departments in light of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum documents.

As experience shows, in organizing study it is important to take account of the particular features and nature of the professional and social activity of cadres. The role of the Znaniye society and trade union and Komsomol organizations in developing mass political study is increasing.

An important role in providing ideological backup for the resolution of national economic tasks, the development of the economy, and the enhancement of its efficiency belongs to the economic training of working people. In the new academic year the working people's economic training and education are oriented toward the resolution of tasks in intensifying production and increasing labor productivity, the cultivation of up-to-date economic thinking on the part of cadres, and the inculcation of socialist enterprise and a businesslike approach. The wider study of the recommended study courses for the 11th 5-year plan on the problems of scientific and technical progress, savings and thrift, the improvement of economic machinery and management, and the implementation of the USSR Food and Energy Programs is envisaged.

It is also planned to prepare new study programs on the following topical themes: the collective contract in the countryside; experience in ensuring a policy of thrift and the team and autonomous financing forms of organizing labor (in industry, construction, and transport); experience in retooling production and reducing manual labor; the accelerated introduction of scientific and technical achievements into production; the labor collective and management. It is important to make provision in the study process for practical work on the study and introduction of leading experience and the acquisition of the techniques of analyzing economic activity at the place of work (in the collective), compiling personal (team) plans for increasing labor productivity, keeping personal savings accounts, and elaborating socialist pledges.

Subjects of day-to-day concern for party organizations are Komsomol political study, the molding in young people of high political and moral qualities and the ability and willingness to work for society's good, and the development of the sense of being a patriot, internationalist, and thrifty master of your own country. In his speech at the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum, Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, speaking of the education of the young generation, noted: "The party seeks to ensure that we educate every person not simply as the receptacle for a certain sum of knowledge, but above all as a citizen of a socialist society, an active builder of communism, with the characteristic ideological principles, morality, and interests, and with a high standard of labor and conduct." The implementation of these directives and the active study of the fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist theory and CPSU policy in close association with sociopolitical practice will form the main content of Komsomol political enlightenment in the new academic year.

If theoretical study is to ensure a deep understanding of party policy and develop a sense of responsibility for the fulfillment of civic duty, it must be effective and creative in its nature. The development of active forms and methods of study is a necessary condition for improving its quality and effectiveness. In recent years some experience has been accumulated here. The discussion of essays and reports, debates, and the problem method of teaching, scientific and practical conferences, and the fulfillment of practical tasks in analyzing production activity and organizing socialist competition have begun to be introduced in practice everywhere. All this has made it possible to launch more widely the movement "Propagandists Working for the 5-Year Plan" and to enhance its role in developing students' labor activeness.

The sociopolitical practice of students in the party study system is being developed increasingly. They are active in giving political briefings and talks to their comrades at work or at their place of residence and take part in analyzing ideological education work in the collective.

All the same, active forms and methods of political study have not yet been introduced everywhere. Many propagandists do not have the necessary mastery of the methodology of such work. The aim should be to ensure that studies do not amount merely to lectures by propagandists and addresses by individual students who have been assigned tasks in advance. The quality of each political study session must be assessed in terms of the standard of the participants' arguments and their ability to demonstrate and uphold the correctness of communist ideals and see the links between their production and social activity and the resolution of the tasks of the whole party and the state.

The new tasks set by the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum demand from party committees major efforts to significantly improve their theoretical and methodological assistance to propagandists. Two-week courses with release from their main work for the time of the studies have become an important form of education of propagandists in the party study system. It is expedient to hold such courses throughout the calendar year in small groups according to subject, which will help improve the organization and quality of the retraining of propagandists. It is necessary to continue to improve the operation of courses, enrich their content with topical problems of party theory and policy and of the ideological struggle in the world arena, and improve the methodology of party study. Particular attention should be devoted to arming propagandists with a knowledge of psychology and teaching methods, counterpropaganda methodology, and the theory of the subject they are teaching. In the coming summer and fall courses propagandists are recommended to devote particular attention to a detailed study of the documents of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum.

Current study for propagandists will continue to take place in permanent seminars attached to party gorkoms and raykoms. Many years of experience show convincingly that a monthly study session for propagandists at a time convenient to them and the constant attention of party committees toward their working conditions can help to increase their propaganda skill and create real conditions for increasing the effectiveness of studies. The irregular holding of propagandists' seminars which can be observed in a number of places can lead to a fall in the quality and effectiveness of party study in general.

The role of universities of Marxism-Leninism in training propagandists is increasing. In the new academic year it is expedient to expand to some extent the extramural departments for training propagandists and consultants for rural party organizations, without increasing the total numbers studying at the universities. It is also necessary to improve other forms of assistance for propagandists, to expand the practice of individual consultations, to develop the work of support schools, the patronage of experienced propagandists over beginners, and the exchange of experience, and to make active use of Propagandists' Day.

Political enlightenment centers and offices are the methodological centers for party propaganda and the propagandists' study locally. It is important to make more effective use of their educational and material base and to create all necessary conditions for fruitful work in providing methodological support for oral political propaganda and agitation.

The mass information and propaganda media -- the press, television, and radio -- provide great assistance to propagandists and students in the political study and economic education system. The journals PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN, POLITICHESKOYE SAMOOBRAZOVANIYE, AGITATOR, and EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA and other central publications, both sociopolitical and scientific, will publish articles and advice on topical theoretical and political issues put forward by the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum and publicize the experience of the party's ideological activity. It is necessary for the oblast, kray, and republican press and local radio and television regularly to publish theoretical and methodological materials for the assistance of propagandists and to publicize leading experience of agitation and propaganda work.

Tasks and measures in further improving party enlightenment and political study for working people arising from the documents of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum should be discussed at party committee sessions, meetings of Communists, and propagandists' conferences.

In bringing up to strength the schools and seminars of party education and mass political study it is necessary more fully to consider the level of educational and political training of communists and the nonparty aktiv and to make use of the creation of intershop and territorial study groups alongside the traditional forms of study which operate directly in primary and shop party organizations. Party committees must strictly observe the CPSU Central Committee's recommendations to the effect that the formation of schools and seminars is expedient only where there are Communists with a good grounding in the sphere of Marxism-Leninism who are capable of working successfully as propagandists, ensuring a high ideological and theoretical standard and effective party study. Where such cadres do not exist, party raykoms and gorkoms must take care to assign consultants to communists who are studying Marxist-Leninist theory independently and to send in propagandists from other organizations.

Exercising effective leadership over party enlightenment means profoundly and comprehensively analyzing the quality of study sessions and their effectiveness, selecting from our vast experience those forms and methods which are of most value in practice today, and improving the monitoring of students' studies and propagandists' work. Herein lies a major reserve for further stepping up the ideological tempering of communists and enhancing their vanguard role in the labor collectives' life.

The CPSU Central Committee June Plenum made lofty demands on party organizations and propagandists in the sphere of improving the Marxist-Leninist training and education of communists and all working people. The implementation of the plenum decisions will help to bring all ideological and ideological-education work up to the standard of present-day tasks and to link it more closely to the practice of socioeconomic and cultural building.

COSMOS-1487 SUCCESSFULLY LAUNCHED 5 AUG

LD051441 Moscow TASS in English 1424 GMT 5 Aug 83

[Text] Moscow August 5 TASS -- The artificial earth satellite "Cosmos-1487" was launched in the USSR today. The Sputnik carries scientific equipment designed to continue the programme of exploration of natural resources of the earth in the interests of different branches of the national economy of the USSR and international cooperation.

The Sputnik was put into an orbit with the following parameters: The initial period of revolution -- 89.5 minutes, the maximum distance form the surface of the earth (in apogee) -- 305 km, the minimum distance from the surface of the earth (in perigee) -- 226 km, the inclination of the orbit -- 82.3 degrees.

Apart from scientific equipment, the Sputnik has radio systems for precise measurement of the elements of the orbit, a radiotelemetric system to transmit back to earth data on the operation of instruments and scientific equipment.

The equipment aboard the Sputnik is functioning normally.

The in-coming information is transmitted to the state scientific-research and production center "Priroda" for it to be processed and used.

UPDATED PROGRESS REPORT ON COSMONAUTS PROGRAM

LD051118 Moscow TASS in English 1024 GMT 5 Aug 83

[Text] Moscow August 5 TASS -- The Soviet Cosmonauts Vladimir Lyakhov and Aleksandr Aleksandrov have been working in orbit for forty days. The programme of scientific research included over the past week technological and biological experiments, study of the upper layers of the earth's atmosphere and registration of the currents of charged particles, technical experiments and medical checkups of the crew.

Two heats were carried out at the electric furnace "Kristall". The aim of the experiments is to produce crystals of the semi-conducting material cadmium selenide.

Within the programme of space materialogy the crew carried out using the "Elektrotopograf" equipment the first series of experiments on studying the effect of open space factors on thin-film coatings. Samples under test were exposed in the air-lock.

The method of electrotopography, used for the first time in manned flights, will make it possible to assess directly aboard the station the state of various construction materials and control periodically the surfaces of spacecraft deployed in terrestrial orbits for lengthy periods.

The portable gamma telescope "Yelena" was used to conduct several cycles of measurement of gamma radiation during the flight of the orbital complex above the regions of the Brazilian magnetic anomaly.

Experiments are continuing on the installations "Oazis" and "Svetoblok" under the biological research programme.

Planned for today are technological experiments "Kristall" and "Elektrotopograf", visual observation under the environmental protection programme, and work with the gamma telescope "Yelena".

The flight programme is being successfully implemented, according to reports from the orbit and telemetry information. Both cosmonauts are feeling fine.